

THE
WORKS
OF THE LATE
M. DE VOLTAIRE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH,
WITH
NOTES,
CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

BY

The Rev. DAVID WILLIAMS.	ELIZABETH GRIFFITH.
HUGH DOWNMAN, M. A.	JAMES PARRY, M. A.
WILLIAM CAMPBELL, LL.D.	AND
RICHARD GRIFFITH, ESQ.	JOHN JOHNSON, M. A.

V O L. II.

L O N D O N:
PRINTED FOR FIELDING AND WALKER,
PATER-NOSTER-ROW.

MDCCLXXX.

rch
tions

THE
WORKS
OF THE LATE
M. DE VOLTAIRE

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH

WITH

NOTES

CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY

BY

THE REV. DAVID WILLIAMS, ELIZABETH GLENNIE,
HUGH BOWMAN, M.A., JAMES PARRY, M.A.,
WILLIAM CAMPBELL, M.A.,
AND
RICHARD GRIFFITH, M.A., JOHN JOHNSON, M.A.



VOL. II.

LONDON

Printed for FIELDING & WALKER,
BANKERS, 15, MARK LANE.
DECEMBER 1820.



A N
E S S A Y
ON THE
MANNERS AND SPIRIT OF NATIONS,

A N D
On the Principal Occurrences in History, from
CHARLEMAGNE to LOUIS XIII.

V O L. - II,



ch ons

..ll .l o y

ESSAY ON THE
MANNERS and SPIRIT of NATIONS,
AND
On the Principal Occurrences in History from
CHARLEMAGNE to LOUIS XIII.

C H A P. LVII.

The Crusaders attack Constantinople.—Of the Misfortunes of that City, and of the Greek Emperors.—Crusade in Egypt. Singular Adventure of St. Francis d'Assise.—The Christians defeated.

THE empire of Constantinople, which had still the title of the Roman empire, was likewise still in possession of all Greece, Thrace, the Archipelago, and Epirus; and its dominion in Europe extended as far as Belgrade and Walachia. It disputed the remains of Asia Minor against the Arabians, the Turks, and the Crusaders, and the arts and sciences were constantly cultivated in the capital of the empire. It had an uninterrupted succession of historians till the time Mahomet II. made himself master of it. These historians were either emperors, princes, or statesmen, but were not on that account better writers. We find them speaking wholly of religion, disguising facts, aiming only at a flow of words, and preserving nothing of the ancient Greek style but its loquacity. Controversy was the favourite study of the court. In the twelfth century the emperor Manuel had a long dispute with his bishops on these words, "My father is greater than I," while he was threatened

VOL. II. Gen. Hist. B by

by the crusaders and the Turks. There was a Greek catechism which anathematized, in the severest manner, that well known verse in the Alcoran, which says, "That God is an infinite being, who has neither begot nor has been begotten of any one." Manuel was for expunging this anathema from the catechism. These disputes signalized and enfeebled his reign. But observe how cautiously Manuel acted with regard to the Mussulmen in this dispute. He was not willing that the Greek catechism should offer so great an insult to a victorious people, who acknowledged only one incommunicable God, and were greatly offended at our doctrine of the Trinity.

Alexis Manuel, his son, who had married a daughter of Louis the Young, king of France, was dethroned by Andronicus, one of his own relations. This Andronicus was himself afterwards deposed by an officer of his palace, named Isaac Angelus, who caused him to be dragged through the streets of the capital, and after cutting off one of his hands, and putting out his eyes, ordered boiling water to be poured over his body, till he expired in the most dreadful agonies.

Isaac Angelus, who punished an usurper with so much barbarity, was himself stripped of the crown by his own brother Alexis Angelus, who ordered his eyes to be put out. This Alexis took the name of Comnenus, though no ways related to the imperial family of that name. It was this emperor who was the cause of the taking of Constantinople by the crusaders.

The son of Isaac Angelus went to implore the assistance of the pope, and above all of the Venetians, against the barbarity of his uncle; and with the hopes of gaining their protection, renounced the Greek church and embraced the communion of the Latins. The Venetians, and some of the princes who had engaged in the crusade, as Baldwin, count of Flanders, and Boniface, marquis of Montferrat, afforded him their dangerous assistance. Such auxiliaries were equally odious to all parties; however they encamped without the city, which was always filled with tumult. Young Alexis,

Alexis, who was detested by the Greeks for having introduced the Latins, soon became the victim of a new faction. One of his relations, named Mirzifios, strangled him with his own hands, and seized on the red sandals, which were part of the insignia of the imperial dignity.

The crusaders, who had then the pretence of revenging the death of their friends, took advantage of the seditions that desolated the city in order to plunder it. They entered almost without resistance, and having put every one they met to the sword, they gave themselves up to all the excess of avarice and fury. Nicetas assures us, that the booty of the French lords alone amounted to four hundred thousand marks of silver. The churches were pillaged; and what sufficiently shews that the disposition of the nation has never changed, is, that the French danced with the ladies in the sanctuary of the church of St. Sophia, while one of the prostitutes who followed Baldwin's army, seated herself on the patriarch's throne, and from thence entertained the company with songs in the style of her profession.

This was the first time that the city of Constantinople was taken and sacked; and this was done by Christians, who had made a vow to fight only against the Infidels.

In all these skirmishes we do not find that the Greek fire, so much boasted of by historians, had the least effect. If it had been what they represent it, it would always have secured the victory both by land and sea. If it was something resembling our phosphorus, it might indeed be preserved in water, but then in that element it would have produced no effect. In short, notwithstanding this secret, the Turks had taken almost all Asia Minor from the Greeks, and the Latins took the rest.

Baldwin, count of Flanders, the most powerful of all the crusaders, caused himself to be elected emperor. There were four pretenders to this dignity, who being assembled in the church of St. Sophia, four

cups filled with wine were placed before them; of these four cups one only was consecrated, and he who drank it was to succeed to the imperial dignity. Baldwin, either through accident or design, took up the consecrated cup, put on the red sandals, and was acknowledged emperor. This new usurper condemned his predecessor, Mirzifios, to be thrown from the top of a high column. The other chiefs of the crusade divided the empire among them. The Venetians took Peloponnesus, the isle of Candia, and many cities on the coast of Phrygia, which had never submitted to the Turkish yoke. The marquiss of Montferrat took Thessaly. Thus there was little left for Baldwin, besides Thrace and Moesia. As to the pope, he gained, at least for a time, the whole eastern church. This conquest however might have been worth a kingdom in time; for Constantinople was a much more valuable acquisition than Jerusalem.

These crusaders, who ruined their brethren the Christians, might more easily than all their predecessors have driven the Turks out of Asia; for the dominions of Saladin were dismembered; but of such a number of knights who had taken a vow to go and succour Jerusalem, only a few of those who were unable to get any share in the spoils of the Greeks, went into Syria. Of this small number was Simon of Montfort, who having in vain attempted to obtain a sovereignty in Greece and Syria, at length put himself at the head of a crusade against the Albigenes, to usurp the estates of Christians under the banner of the cross.

There remained many princes of the family of the Comneni, who did not lose their courage at the destruction of their empire. One of these, whose name was also Alexis, escaped with a few vassals towards Colchis, and there, between the sea and mount Caucasus, founded a small estate called the empire of Trebizond; so much was this word *empire* abused.

Theodore Lascaris retook Nicea, and established himself in Bithynia, by making a seasonable use of the Arabians against the Turks. He also took upon
himself

himself the title of emperor, and caused a patriarch to be elected of his own communion. Other Greeks entered into an alliance even with the Turks, and called to their assistance their ancient enemies the Bulgarians against the new emperor Baldwin of Flanders, who had yet scarcely enjoyed his conquest, when they totally defeated him, near Adrianople, and after cutting off his arms and legs, left him a prey to wild beasts. ¹²⁰⁵

The sources of these emigrations must necessarily ere this have begun to be dried up; but the minds of mankind were still in agitation. Penitents were ordered by their confessors to go to the Holy Land, and the false reports that were every day propagated did not fail to excite new hopes.

A monk of Britany, named Esloin, about the year 1204, conducted a multitude of his countrymen into Syria. The widow of a king of Hungary took the cross, with many other women, believing it impossible to get to heaven without performing this journey. This epidemic frenzy seized even the children, thousands of whom, conducted by their schoolmasters and the monks, left the houses of their parents on the faith of these words, *Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast ordained strength.* Their conductors sold a part to the Mussulmen, and the rest perished through want.

The most considerable state the Christians had preserved in Syria was Antioch; and Ptolemais was the only place they possessed in the kingdom of Jerusalem: yet it was the opinion of the West, that Jerusalem ought to have a king; and Emery of Lusignan, the titular sovereign, dying about the year 1205, the bishop of Ptolemais proposed to go to France to demand a king of Judea, when Philip Augustus nominated a younger son of the house of Brienne in Champagne, who had scarcely any estate. We may by the king's choice form a judgment of that kingdom.

This titular king, together with his knights, some people from Britany, who had crossed the sea, many German

German princes, a duke of Austria, Andrew king of Hungary, who was followed by pretty good troops, the Templars and Hospitallers, and the bishops of Munster and Utrecht, all together might have formed an army of conquerors, if they had had a good general; but this they always wanted.

The king of Hungary retiring, a count of Holland undertook what so many kings and princes had been unable to perform. The Christians seemed now to have a prospect of retrieving their affairs; their hopes were strengthened by the arrival of a multitude of knights brought by a legate from the pope: an archbishop of Bourdeaux, the bishops of Paris, Angers, Autun and Beauvais, accompanied the legate with a considerable body of troops; and besides these, four thousand English and as many Italians, came under several banners: so that John of Brienne, who had arrived at Ptolemais almost alone, found himself at the head of near 100,000 men.

Saphadin, brother to the famous Saladin, who had lately joined Egypt to his other dominions, had just demolished the walls of Jerusalem, which was now only a small ruinous town: but as Saphadin seemed to be but ill established in Egypt, the crusaders imagined they might easily make themselves masters of that country.

From Ptolemais to the mouth of the Nile the passage is very short; and the vessels which had brought such numbers of Christians, carried them in three days to the ancient Pelusium.

Near the ruins of Pelusium is built Damietta, on a causeway that defends it from the inundations of the Nile. The crusaders began the siege during the last illness of Saphadin, and continued it after his death. Meledin, his eldest son, then reigned in Egypt, who was thought to be fonder of the laws, the sciences, and a life of tranquillity, than of war: but Corradin, sultan of Damascus, who was in the possession of all Syria, came to his assistance. The fame of this siege, which

which lasted two years, spread through Europe, Asia and Africa.

St. Francis of Assise, who was at that time founding his order, went himself to the camp of the besiegers; and thinking that he should easily convert the sultan Meledin, he advanced with his companion, friar Illuminatus, to the Egyptian camp, where he was seized and conducted to the sultan. Francis preached to him in Italian, and made a proposal, to cause a large fire to be kindled, into which the Imans on one hand, and he and Illuminatus on the other, should cast themselves to prove which was the true religion. The prince replied with a smile, that his priests were not of the number of those who would leap into the fire in defence of their faith. Francis then proposed to throw himself into it alone; but Meledin told him, that if he should accept of such a proposal, he would be thought to doubt the truth of his religion; and in short, plainly perceiving that Francis was incapable of being a dangerous spy, he dismissed him with marks of his bounty.

Such is the power of enthusiasm, that St. Francis not being able to compass his design of burning himself alive in Egypt and converting the sultan to Christianity, was resolved to make a similar attempt in Morocco. He accordingly took shipping for Spain, but having fallen ill by the way, he prevailed on Friar Giles, and four others who were his companions, to promise to go and convert the people of Morocco. Friar Giles and the four monks set sail for Tetuan, and getting safe to Morocco, preached to the people in Italian out of a cart. The Miramolin, taking compassion on their folly, sent them back again to Spain. They returned a second time and he sent them back as before. They came again a third time, and then the emperor incensed at their insolence, condemned them to death in the divan, and with his own hand struck off their heads. By a custom equally superstitious and barbarous, the emperors of Morocco are the

the chief executioners in their own dominions. The Miramolins stiled themselves the descendants of Mahomet. The first persons who were sentenced to die after the erection of their empire, requested, as a favour, to die by the hands of the emperor, thinking thereby to receive a full expiation of all their sins; since which time this abominable custom has been so well kept up, that Muley Ishmael, the last emperor, during his long reign put to death no less than ten thousand persons.

The death of the five companions of St. Francis d'Assise is still celebrated every year at Coimbra, by a procession as singular as their adventure. It is pretended that the bodies of these Franciscans came back to Europe after their execution, and stopped at Coimbra, in the church of the Holy Cross. Every year, on the night of the arrival of these martyrs, the young men and women of the place go in procession from the church of the Holy Cross, to that of the Franciscans. The young men and boys have nothing on them but a pair of drawers, which do not fall lower than the upper part of their thighs, and the women and girls wear an under-petticoat full as short. The procession has a considerable distance to march, and they stop several times by the way.

Damietta however was taken, which seemed to open a way for the conquest of Egypt; but Pelagius Albano, a Spanish Benedictine, who was a cardinal and the pope's legate, proved the cause of its being lost. The legate pretended, that the pope being the head of all the crusades, he who represented him, had an incontestable right to be general; and that as the king of Jerusalem enjoyed his title only by the pope's permission, he ought to pay an implicit obedience to his legate. These divisions took up some time; they deemed it necessary to write to Rome; and the pope commanding the king to return to the camp, he obeyed, in order to serve under the Benedictine. This general intangled the army between two branches of
the

the Nile, at the very time when that river, which nourishes and protects Egypt was beginning to overflow its banks. The sultan, by the help of sluices, overflowed the Christian camp on the one side, and burnt their vessels on the other. The waters of the Nile continuing to rise, threatened to swallow up the legate's army, ¹²²¹ which was then in the situation in which the Egyptians are described under Pharaoh, when they saw the sea ready to roll in upon them.

Cotemporary writers agree, that in this extremity they entered into a treaty with the sultan, who obliged them to restore Damietta, and sent their army into Phœnicia, after making them swear that they would not commit any acts of hostility against him for eight years; and he kept king John de Brienne as an hostage.

All the hopes of the Christians were now centered in the emperor Frederick II. John de Brienne was no sooner set at liberty, than he gave him his daughter in marriage, and his right to the kingdom of Jerusalem, as her dowry.

The emperor Frederick II. was perfectly sensible of the little advantage to be obtained by crusades; but he was obliged to keep fair with the people, and to elude the power of the pope. In my opinion, the conduct he observed is a model of the most perfect policy. He carried on a negotiation at the same time with the pope and the sultan Meledin; and the treaty between the sultan and him being signed, he set out for Palestine, but it was rather with a retinue than an army. Scarce was he arrived, when he made the treaty public, by which Jerusalem, Nazareth, and some villages, were yielded up to him; and he caused it to be reported in Europe, that he had recovered the holy places without losing a drop of blood. He was reproached with having left by the treaty a mosque in Jerusalem; and the patriarch of that city treated him as an atheist; but in other places he was regarded as a prince who knew how to reign.

Every one who reads the history of those times, will easily perceive, that the writers of romance have scarce been able by the force of imagination to exceed what we here find furnished by truth. A few years before this, we saw a count of Flanders, who having made a vow to go to the holy land, seized on his way the empire of Constantinople: we likewise saw John de Brienne, a younger son of a family in Champagne, elected king of Jerusalem and on the point of subduing Egypt. But all this is trifling when compared with what followed; for this same John de Brienne, after losing his dominions, marched almost alone to the assistance of Constantinople, and arriving there during 1224 an interregnum was elected emperor. His successor, Baldwin II. the last Latin emperor of Constantinople, constantly pressed by Greece, went with the pope's bull in his hand, in vain imploring assistance of the several princes in Europe. All were at that time from home; the emperors of the West were gone to the holy land; the popes were almost always in France; and the kings ready to set out for Palestine.

Theobald of Champagne, king of Navarre, so celebrated for his love for queen Blanch and his songs, 1240 was one of those who embarked for Palestine; but was so happy as to return the same year. About seventy French knights, who had resolved to signalize their courage with him, were all taken and carried prisoners to Grand Cairo, where Melecfala, nephew to Meledin, who inherited both the dominions and the virtues of his uncle, treated them with humanity, and at length permitted them to return to their native country at a moderate ransom.

At this time the territory of Jerusalem belonged neither to the Syrians, the Egyptians, the Christians, nor the Mussulmen: for a revolution, which has had no example, gave a new face to the greatest part of Asia. Genghis-kan and his Tartars broke loose from mount Caucasus, Taurus and Immaus, while the people, who fled before them like savage beasts chased from their haunts by other more terrible animals, over-
ran,

ran, in their turn, the countries that were abandoned at their approach.

The inhabitants of Khorassan, who were called¹²⁴⁴ Khouarazmians, pushed forwards by the Tartars, rushed into Syria, in the same manner as the Goths in the fourth century, impelled by the Scythians, over-ran the Roman empire. These idolatrous Khouarazmians put to the sword all the Turks, Christians and Jews who were then in Jerusalem. The Christians, who remained in Antioch, Tyre and Sidon, and on the coast of Syria, for some time suspended their private quarrels, and united to repel these new banditti. These Christians were then in alliance with the sultan of Damascus: and the Templars, the knights of St. John, and the Teutonic knights, were champions still in arms; for Europe was continually furnishing some volunteers. In short, their united troops engaged the Khouarazmians*, when the Christians were entirely defeated: but this was not the last of their misfortunes; fresh Turks came to ravage the coasts of Syria after the Khouarazmians, and exterminated almost all the knights that were left. Yet these sudden torrents still left the Christians in possession of the towns on the coast.

The Latins, shut up in their maritime towns, now saw themselves deprived of all assistance, and their disputes amongst themselves served only to add to their misfortunes. The princes of Antioch were solely employed in making war on the Christians of Armenia. The factions of the Venetians, the Genoese and the Pisans, disputed the possession of the city of Ptolemais; and the Templars and the knights of St. John were embroiled with each other. Europe, being now cooled, no longer afforded those numerous supplies of armed

* The Khouarazmians were a people of upper Asia, who were conquered by the Tartars in the 13th century, and obliged to retire beyond the Tigris and Euphrates, from whence they addressed themselves to the sultan of Egypt, who permitted them to invade Palestine. T.

pilgrims, so that the hopes of the Christians in the East were extinguished, when St. Louis undertook the last crusade.

C H A P. LVIII.

Of St. Louis.—His Government and Crusade.—The Number of his Ships.—His Expences.—His Virtue.—His Imprudence and Misfortunes.

LOUIS IX. seemed a prince destined, if it had been possible, to reform Europe; to render France triumphant and polite, and to be in every respect a model for mankind to follow. His piety, which was that of an anchorer, did not deprive him of any of the virtues of a king. His liberality was not in the least inconsistent with a wise œconomy. He knew how to reconcile a profound policy with an exact justice; and perhaps no other sovereign besides himself has deserved this praise. He was firm and prudent in his resolves, cool and intrepid in war, and as compassionate as if he had always been unfortunate. It is perhaps not in the power of man to carry virtue to a greater height.

In conjunction with the regent his mother, who well knew how to govern, he had given a check to the abuse of ecclesiastic jurisdiction. The clergy insisted that the civil officers should seize on the estates of excommunicated persons, without examining whether the excommunication was just or not. The king wisely distinguishing between the civil laws, to which the whole society ought to be subject, and the ordinances of the church, whose empire ought to extend only to consciences, would not suffer that the laws of the kingdom should give way to this abuse of excommunications. Having begun his reign with confining the pretensions of the bishops and laity within proper bounds, he put a stop to the factions of Britany; and observed a prudent neutrality, during the violent trans-
ports

ports of Gregory IX. and the vindictive resentment of the emperor Frederick II.

He improved the crown lands, which were already very considerable, by the purchase of several estates. At that time the revenue of the kings of France arose only from their own demesnes, and not from the purses of the people. Their grandeur, like that of any private nobleman depended upon a judicious oeconomy.

This administration had enabled him to raise very powerful armies against Henry III. king of England, and his vassals in France, who united with the English. Henry III. was neither so rich, nor so well obeyed by his subjects; he had neither such good troops, nor were they so soon in readiness. Louis gained two victories over him, particularly the battle of Taillebourg in Poitou, where the king of England fled before him. 1241 This war was followed by an advantageous peace; the vassals of France returned to their obedience, without ever forfeiting it again; and Louis obliged the king of England to pay five thousand pounds sterling for the expence of the campaign.

If we reflect, that when the king behaved with such great prudence, he was only four and twenty years of age, and that his character was ever superior to his fortune, we may easily imagine what glorious things he would have performed, had he continued to reside in his own kingdom: and we shall be induced to lament that France was rendered so unhappy even by his virtues, which under a more prudent direction might have blessed the whole world.

In the year 1244, Louis being attacked by a violent illness, imagined, it is said, while in a state of lethargy, that he heard a voice which ordered him to take up the cross against the infidels; and scarce had he recovered his speech, when he made a vow to carry on a crusade. The queen mother, the queen his wife, his council, and all about him, were sensible of the danger of this fatal vow: even the bishop of Paris represented the dangerous consequences with which it would be attended;

tended; but Louis considered it as a sacred bond, which men were not permitted to unloose. He employed four years in making preparations for this expedition; 1243 and leaving the government of the kingdom to his mother, he set out with his wife, attended by his three brothers with their wives, and almost all the knights in France; among whom were near three thousand knights bannerets. One part of the immense fleet, that carried such a number of princes and soldiers, set out from Marseilles, and the other from Aiguemortes, which is no longer a sea-port.

The greatest part of the large ships of burthen in which the troops of St. Louis were transported, were built in the ports of France. They were eighteen hundred in number. A king of France could not fit out such an armament in these days, by reason that timber of all kinds is beyond comparison dearer, all the concomitant expences greater in proportion, and the artillery which is now used and becomes a necessary part of the equipment, still enhances the expence and difficulty of fitting out so numerous a fleet.

We find from St. Louis's account, how greatly France was impoverished by these crusades. He gave eight thousand livres to the lord of Vallery for thirty knights: the constable had three thousand livres for fifteen. The archbishop of Rheims and the bishop of Langres, received four thousand livres for fifteen knights, whom each had under his command. A hundred and sixty-two knights dined at the king's table: so that these expences and preparations were immense.

If the enthusiasm of crusades, and a scrupulous observance of oaths, had suffered Louis's virtue to listen to the voice of reason, he would not only have seen the injury he did his country, but the extreme injustice of this armament, which appeared to him so just.

Had the project been only to put France in possession of Jerusalem, still the French had no right to it: but he marched against the old, the wise Melecsala, sultan of

of Egypt, who had certainly never given offence to the king of France. Melecfala was a Mussulman, and this was the only pretence for making war against him. There was certainly no more reason for ravaging Egypt, because it was inhabited by those who believed the doctrine of Mahomet, than there would be at present for carrying a war into China, because the inhabitants of that empire are attached to the morals of Confucius.

Louis put into Cyprus, where the king of that island joined him; and sailing from thence they landed in Egypt. At that time the sultan of this country was not in possession of Jerusalem. Palestine was ravaged by the Khouarazmians, to whom the sultan of Syria had relinquished this wretched province; while the caliph of Bagdat, intirely destitute of power, no longer concerned himself in these wars. Ptolemais, Tyre, Antioch, and Tripoli, were still in the possession of Christians, who by their divisions were continually in danger of being a prey either to the Turkish sultans or to the Khouarazmians.

In these circumstances it is difficult to conceive why the king of France should pitch upon Egypt for the scene of war. Melecfala, grown old and sick, demanded a peace, which was refused. Louis was reinforced by fresh succours from France, consisting of sixty thousand fighting men. He was obeyed and beloved by his troops; and as he had to do with an enemy who had already been discomfited, and with a sultan who drew near his end, who would not have imagined that Egypt, and afterwards Syria, would soon have submitted? Yet one half of this flourishing army died of sickness, and the other half was defeated near Massoura. St. 1250 Louis saw his brother Robert of Artois fall in the engagement, and was himself taken prisoner with his two other brothers, the count of Anjou and the count of Poitiers. Melecfala now no longer reigned in Egypt, but was succeeded by his son Almoadan: this new sultan had certainly a very great soul; for king Louis having offered him a million of besants in gold for his
own

own and his fellow-prisoners ransom, Almoadan forgave him a fifth part.

This sultan was murdered by the Mamalukes, whom his father had formed into a militia; and the government, on its being divided, seemed to promise no good to the Christians. However, the Egyptian council continued to treat with the king; and the *sieur de Joinville* asserts, that the emirs themselves proposed in one of their assemblies to chuse Louis for their sultan.

Joinville was prisoner with the king; and though what is related by a man of his character, has doubtless some weight, yet if we reflect how often in a camp, or in a house, we are misinformed of the particular facts that are performed in a neighbouring camp, or in the next house; and how improbable it is, that Mussulmen should think of chusing for their king a Christian enemy, who was neither acquainted with their language nor their manners, who detested their religion and could only be considered by them as the chief of a band of foreign robbers, we shall find that Joinville has only related a popular subject of discourse. A faithful relation of what we hear is frequently nothing more than a repetition of what ought at least to be suspected. But we have not Joinville's genuine history; it is only an inaccurate translation made in the reign of Francis I. of a writing which at present would be extremely difficult to understand.

I know not how to reconcile what historians relate of the manner in which these prisoners were treated by the Mahometans. We are told, that they brought them one by one out of the place in which they were confined, and after asking them if they would renounce Jesus Christ, cut off the heads of all those who persisted in Christianity.

On the other hand, they attest that an old emir asked the prisoners by an interpreter, if they believed in Christ, and they having answered in the affirmative, the hermit replied, " Console yourselves then, since
" he

"he died for you, and is risen again, he will certainly save you."

These two accounts seem a little contradictory; and what is a greater contradiction still, is, that the emirs should kill those captives from whom they expected a ransom.

After this we are told, that these emirs contented themselves with the eight hundred thousand besants, to which the sultan had limited the ransom of the captives. And when in virtue of the treaty the French troops in Damietta evacuated that city, we do not find that the conquerors committed the least outrage on the women, but dismissed the queen and her sisters-in-law with marks of respect. Not that all the Mahometan soldiers behaved with moderation; for the vulgar in all countries are rude and brutish: there were doubtless many acts of violence committed, and captives ill used and slain; but I confess, that I am astonished that the Mahometan soldiery did not exterminate a greater number of these strangers, who, without any reasonable pretext, had sailed from the ports of Europe to lay waste the territories of Egypt.

St. Louis was no sooner delivered from captivity than he retired to Palestine, and stayed there near four years with the remains of his fleet and army. Instead of returning to France, he went to visit Nazareth, and at length repaired to his own dominions, but not till after the death of queen Blanch his mother; and then only in order to form a new crusade.

His residence at Paris procured him many advantages, and an increase of glory. He had an honour done him, which none but a virtuous king could expect. Henry III. king of England, and his barons, pitched upon him as an arbitrator to decide their differences. He pronounced his award like a sovereign; and though this award, which was in favour of Henry, did not put a stop to the troubles of England, it served however to convince all Europe of the respect which mankind naturally pay to virtue. His brother, the count of Anjou, was indebted to Louis's reputation,

and to the good order which prevailed throughout the kingdom, for the honour of being nominated by the pope to the throne of Sicily.

Louis, in the mean time, increased his demesnes by the acquisition of Namur, Peronne, Avranches, Mortagne, and Perche. He might have stripped the kings of England of all their possessions in France; the quarrels between Henry III. and his barons affording him a very good opportunity; but he preferred justice to usurpation. He suffered them to enjoy Guienne, Perigord, and the Limousin; yet he obliged them absolutely to relinquish Touraine, Poitou, and Normandy, which had been reunited to the crown by Philip Augustus. Thus he concluded an honourable peace.

He was the first that established the superior courts of justice, in consequence of which the subjects, who had been hitherto oppressed by the arbitrary decisions of the judges of the baronies, began to have it in their power to remove their cause by appeal to four great royal bailiwicks, created on purpose to redress their grievances. It was in his reign that men of letters were first admitted to sit in the parliaments, in which the lives and properties of the subjects had till then been determined by knights, who seldom knew how to read. To the piety of a recluse, he joined the prudence and resolution of a king, when he checked the encroachments of the see of Rome, by that famous pragmatic sanction, which preserves the ancient rights and liberties of the Gallican church.

In short, his presence for thirteen years together repaired the damage France had sustained during his absence: but he was still infatuated with a fondness for crusades, which the popes encouraged, and Clement IV. granted him a tenth penny out of the revenues of the clergy for three years. At length he departed a second time with nearly the same force as before; and his brother, whom he made king of Sicily, was to follow him: but his devotion led him to turn his arms
neither

neither to the coast of Palestine, nor to that of Egypt; he now directed his fleet towards Tunis.

The Christians of Syria were not descended from those Franks who first settled in Antioch and Tyre. They were a mixed breed of Syrians, Armenians, and Europeans. They were called *Colts*; and these weak remains were subject for the most part to the Egyptians. The Christians had no other strong towns left than Tyre and Ptolemais.

The knights Templars and the Hospitallers, who in some sense may be compared to the militia of the Mamelukes, were so furiously intent on cutting one another's throats in these very towns, that in an engagement between those military monks we are told that not one Templar was left alive.

But what had this situation of a few mongrel wretches, on the coast of Syria, to do with St. Louis's voyage to Tunis? His brother, Charles of Anjou, king of Naples and Sicily, an ambitious, cruel, and selfish prince, made the heroic piety of Louis subservient to his private views, by pretending that the king of Tunis owed him some arrears of tribute. He wanted to be sovereign of that country; and St. Louis, according to the testimony of all the historians (but I know not on what foundation) hoped to make a convert of the king of Tunis. Strange method of making a profelyte to Christianity! He invaded this prince's dominions, and landed his forces near the ruins of Carthage.

But Louis himself was soon besieged in his camp by the united forces of the Moors. The same diseases, which the intemperance of his transplanted subjects, and the change of climate, had brought into his camp in Egypt, desolated his Carthaginian camp; and one of his sons, born during his captivity at Damietta, died of this kind of contagion before Tunis. At length this disease attacked the king, who caused himself to be laid on ashes*, and expired at the age of fifty five,

* This was considered as a mark of piety.—St. Bruno, who died in 1101, and who founded the order of Carthusians,

1270 with the piety of a saint and the courage of a hero. This is one of the most remarkable instances of the caprice of fortune, that the ruins of Carthage should behold a Christian resigning his last breath, who was come to fight the Mahometans in a country where Dido had introduced the Syrian gods. Scarce was he dead, when his brother, the king of Sicily arrived, who concluded a peace with the Moors; and the remains of the Christians were brought back to Europe.

We cannot reckon less than one hundred thousand persons sacrificed in St. Louis's two expeditions; and if we add to these the fifty thousand who followed Frederick Barbarossa, the three hundred thousand in the crusade under Philip Augustus and Richard, the two hundred thousand at least in the time of John de Brienne, and also reckon the one hundred and sixty thousand who had before passed into Asia, and do not forget those that perished in the expedition to Constantinople, and in the wars that followed this revolution, without mentioning the crusade in the North, and that against the Albigenes, we shall find that the East was the tomb of above two millions of Europeans. Several countries were depopulated and impoverished by these expeditions. The sieur de Joinville says expressly, that he would not attend St. Louis to the second crusade, because he could not, the former having ruined his estate.

St. Louis's ransom cost eight hundred thousand besants, that is, about nine millions of livres present currency in this year 1760. If out of two millions who died in the Levant, each man carried with him only a hundred livres, this will make the expence amount to two hundred millions of livres to the nation. The

established it as a rule, that when any of his monks were observed to be in the agonies of death, they should be taken out of bed, and placed on the floor with their arms and legs extended in the form of a cross. This horrid ceremony still continues to be adopted in all the Carthusian convents. T.

Genoese,

Genoese, the Pisans, and especially the Venetians, were enriched by these expeditions; but France, England, and Germany were exhausted.

It has been asserted that the kings of France gained by these crusades, because St. Louis increased his demesnes by purchasing the estates of a few lords who were ruined; but he increased them only by his œconomy, during the thirteen years he resided in the kingdom.

The only advantages resulting from these expeditions, was the liberty which many boroughs purchased of their lords. Thus the municipal government grew slowly out of the ruin of the possessors of fiefs. By degrees these corporations being able to work and to carry on trade on their own account, revived the arts and manufactures, which had been neglected in times of slavery.

In the mean time this small number of mongrel Christians, cantoned on the coast of Syria, were soon exterminated, or made slaves. Ptolemais, their principal asylum, and which indeed was nothing better than a nest of banditti, could not resist the forces of Meleceraph, sultan of Egypt, who took it in the year 1291. Tyre and Sidon surrendered to him also. In short, towards the end of the twelfth century not the least trace of these emigrations of the Christians was to be observed in Asia.

C H A P. LIX.

*Continuation of the taking of Constantinople by the Crusaders.—
Of the State of the Greek Empire.*

WE have already had occasion to observe, that the feudal government of France produced many conquerors. The duke of Normandy, a peer of France, subdued England: private gentlemen conquered Sicily; and amongst the crusaders the lords of
France

1270 with the piety of a saint and the courage of a hero. This is one of the most remarkable instances of the caprice of fortune, that the ruins of Carthage should behold a Christian resigning his last breath, who was come to fight the Mahometans in a country where Dido had introduced the Syrian gods. Scarce was he dead, when his brother, the king of Sicily arrived, who concluded a peace with the Moors; and the remains of the Christians were brought back to Europe.

We cannot reckon less than one hundred thousand persons sacrificed in St. Louis's two expeditions; and if we add to these the fifty thousand who followed Frederick Barbarossa, the three hundred thousand in the crusade under Philip Augustus and Richard, the two hundred thousand at least in the time of John de Brienne, and also reckon the one hundred and sixty thousand who had before passed into Asia, and do not forget those that perished in the expedition to Constantinople, and in the wars that followed this revolution, without mentioning the crusade in the North, and that against the Albigenes, we shall find that the East was the tomb of above two millions of Europeans. Several countries were depopulated and impoverished by these expeditions. The sieur de Joinville says expressly, that he would not attend St. Louis to the second crusade, because he could not, the former having ruined his estate.

St. Louis's ransom cost eight hundred thousand besants, that is, about nine millions of livres present currency in this year 1760. If out of two millions who died in the Levant, each man carried with him only a hundred livres, this will make the expence amount to two hundred millions of livres to the nation. The

established it as a rule, that when any of his monks were observed to be in the agonies of death, they should be taken out of bed, and placed on the floor with their arms and legs extended in the form of a cross. This horrid ceremony still continues to be adopted in all the Carthusian convents.

T. Genoeze,

Genoese, the Pisans, and especially the Venetians, were enriched by these expeditions; but France, England, and Germany were exhausted.

It has been asserted that the kings of France gained by these crusades, because St. Louis increased his demesnes by purchasing the estates of a few lords who were ruined; but he increased them only by his œconomy, during the thirteen years he resided in the kingdom.

The only advantages resulting from these expeditions, was the liberty which many boroughs purchased of their lords. Thus the municipal government grew slowly out of the ruin of the possessors of fiefs. By degrees these corporations being able to work and to carry on trade on their own account, revived the arts and manufactures, which had been neglected in times of slavery.

In the mean time this small number of mongrel Christians, cantoned on the coast of Syria, were soon exterminated, or made slaves. Ptolemais, their principal asylum, and which indeed was nothing better than a nest of banditti, could not resist the forces of Meleceraph, sultan of Egypt, who took it in the year 1291. Tyre and Sidon surrendered to him also. In short, towards the end of the twelfth century not the least trace of these emigrations of the Christians was to be observed in Asia.

C H A P. LIX.

*Continuation of the taking of Constantinople by the Crusaders.—
Of the State of the Greek Empire.*

WE have already had occasion to observe, that the feudal government of France produced many conquerors. The duke of Normandy, a peer of France, subdued England: private gentlemen conquered Sicily; and amongst the crusaders the lords of France

France were for some time in the possession of Antioch and Jerusalem; in short, Baldwin, a peer of France, and count of Flanders, took Constantinople. The Mahometans of Asia, as we have seen, yielded Nicea to the fugitive emperors of Greece, and they even joined in an alliance with the Greeks against the Franks and Latins, their common enemies. During this time, the irruptions of the Tartars in Asia and Europe, prevented the Greeks from being oppressed by the Mussulmen: the Franks, who possessed Constantinople, elected their emperors, and the popes confirmed the election.

Peter de Courtenay, count of Auxerre, of the house
 1216 of France, being elected, was crowned and consecrated at Rome by pope Honorius III. The popes then flattered themselves that they disposed of the empires of the East and West. We have already seen what sort of a right they had to the empire of the West, and what a deal of blood was spilt about this pretension. In regard to the East, the whole affair was reduced to Constantinople, and part of Thrace and Thessaly. Yet the Latin patriarch, notwithstanding his submission to the pope, pretended it was part of his office to crown his masters; while the Greek patriarch, who resided sometimes at Nicea, and sometimes at Adrianople, anathematized the Latin empire, together with the patriarch of that communion, and even the pope himself. This Latin empire of Constantinople was so inconsiderable, that Peter de Courtenay, returning from Rome, could not avoid falling into the hands of
 1218 the Greeks, and after his death his successors possessed only the city of Constantinople, and the territories adjacent. The French were in possession of Achaia, and the Venetians were masters of the Morea.

Constantinople, which had been formerly so opulent, was grown so poor, that Baldwin II. (I can hardly tell how to call him emperor) pledged to the Venetians, for a sum of money, the crown of thorns worn by Jesus Christ, his linen, his coat, his napkin, and many pieces of the true cross, which St. Louis redeemed,
 and

and placed in the holy chapel of Paris, with other relics that are testimonies of his piety, rather than of his knowledge in antiquity.

We find this Baldwin II. repairing in 1245 to the council of Lyons, in which pope Innocent IV. so solemnly excommunicated Frederick II. He there in vain implored the assistance of a crusade, and returned to Constantinople only to see it fall at last into the hands of the Greeks, its lawful possessors. Michael Paleologus, emperor and guardian of the young emperor Lascaris, retook the city by means of a secret intelligence; Baldwin fled into France, and lived on the money for which he had sold his marquisate of Namur to St. Louis. Thus ended this empire of the crusaders.

The Greeks brought back their manners into their empire, and revived the custom of putting out people's eyes. Michael Paleologus signalized the commencement of his reign, by depriving his pupil of his sight and liberty. It was before the practice, on these occasions, to make use of a red hot plate of metal; but Michael used boiling vinegar; and the custom is still preserved, for there is such a thing as fashion even in the most criminal actions.

Paleologus did not fail to get himself solemnly absolved for this cruel action, by his patriarch and bishops, who are said to have burst into tears of joy at this pious ceremony. Paleologus beat his breast, asked God pardon, but took care not to set his ward and sovereign at liberty.

When I say that superstition returned with the Greeks to Constantinople, I need only for proof what happened in 1284. The empire being divided between two patriarchs; the emperor ordained that each party should present a memorial of his reasons to the Deity in the church of St. Sophia, and that the two memorials should be thrown into an hallowed pan of coals, that God might manifest his will. But the will of heaven was manifested no other way than by suffering both the
papers

papers to be burnt, and abandoning the Greeks to their ecclesiastical disputes.

The eastern empire however recovered a little strength. Greece had been joined to it before the crusades, but it had lost almost all Asia Minor and Syria: Greece was separated from it after the crusades; but a little of Asia Minor remained, and in Europe it extended as far as Belgrade.

All the other parts of this empire were possessed by new nations. Egypt fell a prey to the Mamalukes, a militia composed at first of slaves, and afterwards of conquerors. These Mamalukes were soldiers, raised in the northern coasts of the Black sea: and this new militia was established about the time of St. Louis's captivity.

The caliphate was drawing towards an end in the thirteenth century, at a time when the empire of Constantine was likewise very near expiring. Twenty new usurpers were tearing on every side the monarchy founded by Mahomet, while they submitted to his religion; and at length the caliphs of Babylon, named the caliphs of the dynasty of the Abassides, were entirely destroyed by the family of Genghis-kan.

Thus in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries there was an uninterrupted series of devastations throughout our whole hemisphere. Nations fell back upon one another by prodigious emigrations, which by degrees laid the foundation of vast empires. For while the crusaders poured in great swarms upon Syria, the Turks were undermining the Arabians; and at length started up the Tartars, who fell upon the Turks, the Arabians, the Indians, and the Chinese. These Tartars, under the command of Genghis-kan and his sons, changed the whole face of the greater Asia, while Asia Minor and Syria were the grave of Franks and Saracens.

C H A P. LX.

Of the East, and Genghis-kan.

ON the other side of Persia, towards the Gihon and the Oxus, a new empire arose out of the ruins of the Cailphate. We call it Khouarazm or Khorassan, from the corrupt name of its conquerors. Sultan Mahammed reigned in this country at the end of the twelfth, and the beginning of the thirteenth century, when these extensive countries became a prey to the Tartars. Mohammed's dominions extended from the further end of Irac, or the ancient Media, beyond the province of Sogdiana, and far up into the country of the Tartars. He had added to his territories a part of India, so that he was one of the most powerful monarchs in the world: but still he paid homage to the caliph, whom he was stripping of his dominions, and who had nothing left but Bagdat.

Beyond the mounts Taurus and Caucasus, to the east of the Caspian sea, and of the Volga as far as China, and northward as far as the frigid zone, is stretched that immense tract of land, the country of the ancient Scythians, who were afterwards called Tartars, from Tatakaen one of their greatest princes, and whom we distinguish by the name of Tartars. This country seems to have been peopled time immemorial, without having any towns or cities. These people, as well as the Arabians, having imbibed from Nature a taste for liberty and a wandering life, consider towns as prisons, in which sovereigns confine their slaves.

Their continual incursions, their frugal manner of living, their moderate rest either in a tent, or a cart, or on the ground, has rendered them a hardy race, inured to fatigue, who like wild beasts that multiply too fast, have roamed far from their dens; one time towards the Palus Mæotis, when they drove away the inhabitants of those countries, who in the fifth century fell upon the Roman empire; another time to the East

and South, towards Armenia and Persia; and another time towards China, and even as far as India. Thus this vast reservoir of an ignorant but warlike race, has spread its inundations almost over our whole hemisphere; and the illiterate herd that now inhabit those deserts, know no more than that their ancestors were conquerors of the world.

Each horde or tribe had its chief, and several chiefs were united under a kan. The tribes near the Dailailama adored him; an adoration consisting chiefly in a small tribute; the others had no other worship than that of sacrificing a few animals once a year to the Supreme Being. It is not said that they ever offered up human victims to the Deity, or that they believed in a powerful and malicious spirit, such as the devil. The wants and occupations of a vagrant life, prevented their falling into a great many superstitions, which are the offspring of idleness: they had no failings but such as are the necessary consequence of a savage manner of living; and those very failings contributed to their conquests.

All that I am able to collect with any degree of certainty, concerning the origin of the great revolution, brought about by those Tartars in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, is that eastward of China the hordes of Monguls or Moguls, who have the best iron mines, manufactured that metal, which conquers those who are masters of every thing else. Cal-kan, or Gassar-kan, the grandfather of Genghis-kan, being at the head of those tribes which were more warlike and better armed than the rest, compelled several of his neighbours to pay homage to him, and founded a kind of monarchy, such as may be supposed to exist among a wandering people impatient of subjection. His son, whom the Europeans call Pisouca, settled this rising empire; and Genghis-Kan at length extended it over the greatest part of the known world.

Between his dominions and China there was a powerful state, subject to a kan, whose ancestors had renounced the vagrant life of the Tartars, and built themselves

themselves towns after the example of the Chinese. This kan was even known in Europe; and is he who for some time went by the name of *Prester-John*. Some critics have pretended to prove that the right name is *Priest-John*, though there was certainly no reason for calling him either *Prester* or *Priest*.

It is certain however, that the reputation of his capital was spread over all Asia, and had excited the cupidity of some Armenian merchants, who were of the ancient sect of Nestorius. Some of their monks set out along with them upon the journey, and in order to recommend themselves to the Christian princes, who at that time were waging war in Syria, they wrote word that they had converted this great kan, who was the most powerful of all the Tartars; that they had christened him by the name of John, and that he had been even desirous of going into orders. This is the idle story that rendered the name of *Prester-John* so famous in the ancient chronicles of the crusades. People went to look for *Prester-John* afterwards into Ethiopia, where they gave this name to a negro prince, who is half a schismatic, and half a Jew. In the mean time the Tartar *Prester-John* received a total overthrow from Genghis's army. The conqueror seized his dominions, and was chosen sovereign of all the Tartar kans, by the title of Genghis-kan, which signifies *king of kings*, or the *great kan*. His former name was Temugin. It seems that the Tartar kans had a custom of convoking their diets towards spring; which diets were called *cour-ilté*. Who knows but those meetings, and the plenary courts of the Gauls in the month of March and May, are derived from the same original?

Genghis-kan decreed in this assembly that they should believe in one God only, and persecute no man for his religion: a sure proof that his vassals were not all of one persuasion. Military discipline was strictly enforced: all the officers from the lowest subaltern to those who had the general command, were bound to daily duties: and those who did not take the field, were obliged to work one day in the week for the service of

the great kan. Adultery was prohibited with so much the more severity, as there was a toleration of polygamy. There remained but one district in Tartary, where the inhabitants were permitted to continue the practice of prostituting their women to travellers. Witchcraft was expressly prohibited upon pain of death. We have already observed that Charlemagne punished it only by fines. But it follows from thence that the Germans, Franks and Tartars, all believed alike in witchcraft. Genghis-kan, in this great assembly of barbarous princes, had recourse to an artifice which in the history of the world, we shall find has been often employed. A prophet foretold that Genghis would be sovereign of the universe; which was an encouragement to the vassals of the grand kan, to fulfil the prediction.

The Chinese author who has written the conquests of Genghis-kan, and whose work has been translated by father Gaubel, assures us that the Tartars had not the least knowledge of the art of writing. This art was wholly unknown to all the people between the province of Archangel and the Great Wall; as it was also to the Celtes, the Britons, the Germans, the Scandinavians, and all the people of Africa on the other side of Mount Atlas. The use of transmitting to posterity the several articulations of speech, and the ideas of the mind, was one of the great refinements of society, improved and known only to some nations more highly civilized than others, but which was never universally practiced even among those nations. The Tartars delivered their laws by oral traditions, and had no symbols to perpetuate the memory of them. It was in this manner that Genghis published a new law, which was likely to transform his soldiers into heroes. He made it capital for any one whose assistance was called for in time of battle, to run away. Having quickly subdued the several countries situated betwixt the river Volga and the wall of China, at length he fell upon this ancient empire, which at that time was called Cathai. He took Cambalu, the capital of North Cathai; the very same city
which

which now goes by the name of Pekin. After he had made himself master of half of China, he carried his victorious arms to the extremity of Corea.

The reader, even were he accustomed to the most romantic fictions, would hardly imagine, that a prince would set out from the further end of Corea, which is the eastern extremity of our globe, to wage war in Persia and India. And yet this is what Genghis-kan performed.

The caliph of Bagdat, whose name was Nasser, imprudently called him to his assistance. At that time the caliphs were, as we have already observed, in the same condition, as the indolent kings of France under the tyranny of the mayors of the palace: the Turks were the mayors of the caliphs.

Sultan Mohammed of the race of the Khouarazmians, of whom we have lately made mention, was sovereign of almost all Persia; and Armenia, being in a weak condition, paid him tribute. The caliph Nasser, whom Mohammed wanted to strip of this shadow of dignity, invited Genghis-kan into Persia.

The Tartar conqueror was at that time sixty years old: it seems he understood the art of government as well as the sword; and his life is a proof that no one can be a great conqueror who is not an able politician. A conqueror is a man who knows how to make a proper use of the arms of others. Genghis's administration of the conquered part of China was so prudent, that it never revolted during his absence; and so perfectly did he understand how to rule his family, that his four sons, who were his lieutenant-generals, placed their whole study and emulation in serving him, and contributing to his victories.

Our European battles appear like skirmishes, when compared to some of those engagements, which have imbrued the fields of Asia in blood. Sultan Mohammed marched against Genghis with an army of four hundred thousand men, beyond the river Jaxartes near the city of Otrara: and in those immense plains, which extend from that city to the forty-second degree of latitude,

tude, he met the Tartar army of seven hundred thousand men, commanded by Genghis and his four sons. The Mahometans were defeated, and Otrara taken. At this siege they made use of a ram; a military engine which, like the bow and arrow, seems to have been the natural invention of almost all nations.

From the countries situated towards the Tranfoxana, the conqueror advanced to Bochara, a city celebrated over all Asia for its extensive commerce, its woollen manufactures, and especially for the sciences, which the Turkish sultans had learnt of the Arabians, and which flourished in Bochara and Samarcand. If we may give credit to the kan Abulgasi, to whom we are indebted for the history of the Tartars, *Bocar* signifies *learned*, in the Tartar-Mogul language; and from this etymology, of which there does not remain the least vestige, comes the name of Bochara. The Tartars, after plundering the town, reduced it to ashes; as Alexander had treated Persopolis. But the Orientals, who wrote the history of Genghis-kan, say that he did it in revenge for the ill treatment of his ambassadors, whom the sultan had put to death before this war. If there is any excuse for Genghis, there can be none for Alexander.

All those vast countries to the east and south of the Caspian sea were subdued; and sultan Mohammed was obliged to fly from one province to another, carrying with him his treasure and his bad fortune, till at length he died abandoned by all the world. The conqueror penetrated as far as the river Indus; and while one of his armies was employed in the conquest of Indostan, another under the command of his son subdued all the provinces to the south and west of the Caspian sea, viz. Khorassan, Irak, Shirvan and Aran. They passed the iron gates, not far from whence the city of Derbent* is said to have been built by Alexander.

* Pliny gives the name of *portæ Caucasæ* to this city, which is situated in the straight passage between mount Caucasus and the Caspian sea. The Turks call it *Demir* or *Temir Capi*, i. e. *the iron gates*. T.

This is the only pass on that side from the Upper Asia, across the rugged and inaccessible Mount Caucasus. From thence this victorious army marched along the Volga towards Moscow, and ravaged all Russia; taking or killing a prodigious number of cattle and slaves. Loaded with this booty, they repassed the Volga, and returned to meet Genghis-kan by the north-east of the Caspian. No traveller, it is said, had ever been round that sea; and those troops were the first that undertook such a tour, through uncultivated countries, impervious to any but Tartars, who wanted no tents, magazines, or baggage, and who fed upon horse-flesh like that of other animals.

Thus Genghis, in about eighteen years, conquered one half of China and the half of Indostan, with almost all Persia as far as the Euphrates, the frontiers of Russia, Casan, Astracan, and Great Tartary. It is certain that that part of Tibet in which the Grand Lama reigns, was incorporated into his empire, and that the pontiff was not molested by Genghis, who had a great many worshippers of that human idol in his armies. All conquerors have spared the supreme heads of religion, because they generally flatter their vanity, and the submission of the pontiff is attended with that of the common people.

Returning from the Indies through Persia, and the ancient Sogdiana, he stopped in the city of Toncat to the north-east of the river Jaxartes, as the center of his vast empire. His sons, victorious on all sides, his generals, and tributary princes, brought him the treasures of Asia. He distributed largesses to his soldiers, who had been hitherto strangers to this kind of opulence. Hence it is that the Russians to this very day frequently find ornaments of gold and silver, and other monuments of luxury buried under ground in the wilds of Tartary. These are at present the only remains of such numerous depredations.

He held a triumphal court in the plains of Toncat, in which his magnificence equalled the martial preparations, with which he began his conquests. On this occasion

occasion there appears a mixture of Tartar barbarism and Asiatic luxury. All the kans and their vassals, the companions of his victories, were mounted on those ancient Scythian cars, the use of which subsists to this day among the Crim Tartars; and those cars were covered with costly stuffs, with the gold and diamonds of so many conquered nations. In this assembly one of Genghis' sons made his father a present of a hundred thousand horses. It was in those states general of Asia that he received homage of above five hundred ambassadors from the conquered countries. He hastened from thence to reduce again under his yoke the extensive country called Tangut, which borders on China; and although he was then near seventy years of age, he was anxious to complete the conquest of this great empire, the favourite object of his ambition. But at length he was seized with a mortal illness in his camp, as he was upon his march, within a few leagues of the Great Wall.

Never did any man before or since his time subdue a greater number of nations. His conquests extended above eighteen hundred leagues from east to west, and upwards of a thousand from north to south. But this conqueror was a destroyer; for if we except Bochara and two or three more towns which he suffered to be rebuilt, his empire, from the frontiers of Russia to that of China, was one continued scene of desolation. China was less ransacked, because after the taking of Pekin, the rest of the provinces which he invaded made no resistance. Before his death, he shared his dominions among his four sons, each of whom was one of the most potent princes of the earth.

It is said that a great many men were sacrificed over his tomb, and that this usage was continued at the death of his successors who reigned in Tartary. This is an ancient custom of the Scythian princes, which was lately discovered also among the negroes of Congo; a custom worthy of human barbarity. Some pretend that it was a point of honour among the domestics of the Tartar kans to die with them, and that they disputed

puted with one another the honour of being interred with their masters. If this fanaticism was common, and if death was so trifling a thing to these people, they were formed for the conquest of the world. The admiration of the Tartars for Genghis-kan greatly increased, when he was no more: so that they imagined he was not born like other men, but that his mother had conceived him by the sole aid of a celestial influence; as if the rapidity of his conquests was not a sufficient prodigy. If such men are to have a supernatural father, we must suppose him to be a malignant being.

The sons of this conqueror extended still farther the dominions left them by their father. Octai, and soon after Coblai-kan, the son of Octai, completed the conquest of China. It is this Coblai that Mark Paolo saw towards the year 1260, when he travelled with his brother and uncle into those countries, which were not even so much as known at that time by name, and which he calls Cathai. This Mark Paolo is celebrated over all Europe for his travels into the territories subdued by Genghis-kan; but Europe soon forgot those territories and their conqueror.

It is true that pope Innocent IV. sent some Franciscan friars into Tartary in the year 1246; but these monks, who stiled themselves ambassadors, saw but little, were treated with the greatest contempt, and did no manner of service.

So little were the Europeans acquainted with what passed in that vast part of the world, that an impostor, whose name was David, made St. Louis, when in Syria, believe he was deputed to wait on him by the great kan of Tartary, who had embraced Christianity: St. Louis sent Rubruquis the monk into those countries in 1258, to inquire about the matter. By the relation of Rubruquis it appears, that he was introduced to the grandson of Genghis-kan, who reigned in China. But what information could be expected from a monk, who travelled among a people whose language he did not understand, and who was not capable of making

a right judgment of what he did see? All that he brought back with him after his travels, consisted in a great many false notions, and a few truths of no consequence.

Thus, at the time that the Christian princes and barons were imbruing the kingdom of Naples, Greece, Syria, and Egypt, with human blood, Asia was overrun by the Tartars: so that almost our whole hemisphere was ravaged at the same period.

The monks, who travelled through Tartary in the thirteenth century, tell us, that Genghis and his sons governed their Tartars with absolute sway. But can it be supposed that armed conquerors, who in conjunction with their chief went in search of plunder, to be equally shared between them: men, by nature robust, free, and used to a wandering life, making the snow their beds in winter, and sleeping on the dewy fields in summer, would suffer themselves to be treated like beasts of burthen by the persons they had chosen to be their leaders? This was far from being the disposition of the people of the North. The Alands, the Huns, the Gepidæ, the Turks, the Goths, and the Franks, were all of them the companions, not the slaves of their barbarous chiefs. Despotic power is the work only of time, and the result of a long struggle between the spirit of ruling and the spirit of independence. A chief has always more ways of opposing his companions, than they have of resisting, and at length money renders him absolute.

The monk Planus Carpinus, who was sent in 1243, by pope Innocent IV. to Caracerum, at that time the capital of Tartary, and who was present at the inauguration of a son of the great kan Octai, relates, that the principal Tartars made their kan sit down upon a piece of beaver's skin, and addressed him thus: "Honour the great, be just and merciful to every one, otherwise thou shalt be so wretched, that thou shalt not be worth the skin on which thou now sittest." This was not the speech of a slavish courtier.

Genghis

Genghis availed himself of the right which the oriental princes have always claimed, a right similar to that of fathers of families in the Roman law, of chusing their heirs, and dividing their estates among the children without regard to seniority. He appointed his third son Octai great kan of Tartary, whose posterity reigned in the north of China till towards the middle of the fourteenth century. The Tartars were introduced into that country by force of arms, and expelled from thence by religious quarrels. The priests called Lamas wanted to exterminate the Bonzes, and these stirred up the people. The princes of the Chinese race took advantage of this ecclesiastic dispute, and at length drove out their masters, whom plenty and indolence had enervated.

Another son of Genghis-kan, whose name was Touchi, had Turquestan, Bactriana, the kingdom of Astracan, and the country of the Usbecks. The son of this Touchi penetrated as far as Poland, Dalmatia, Hungary, and even to the gates of Constantinople. He was called Batou-kan. The princes of Crim Tartary are descended from him by the male line; and the Usbeck kans, who are now settled in Proper Tartary, to the north and east of the Caspian sea, refer their original also to the same source. They are masters of North Bactriana; but they lead only a vagrant life in that fine country, which they have turned into a desert.

Tuti, or Tuli, the third son of Genghis, had Persia in his father's life-time. The son of this Tuti, whose name was Houlacou, passed the Euphrates, which Genghis-kan never did. He subverted the empire of the caliphs in Bagdat, and made himself master of part of Asia Minor or Natolia, while the natural lords of that fruitful part of the Greek empire were driven from their capital by the Christian crusaders.

A fourth son, named Zagatai, had Transoxana, Candahor, the north part of India, Cachemir, and Tibet: and the descendants of all those four monarchs

maintained for some time their empires, which had been founded in plunder.

If we compare these vast and sudden depredations with the transactions of our days in Europe, we shall find a surprizing difference between them. Our generals, who understand the art of war incomparably better than Genghis, or than many of the other conquerors of ancient times, aided with armies, a simple detachment of which, with a few cannon, would have put to rout all those numerous hordes of Huns, Alands, and Scythians, can with difficulty take a few towns in the most successful expeditions. The reason is, that in those days there was no art in war; strength alone decided the fate of the world.

Genghis and his sons, elated with the rapidity of their success, thought that they should be able to conquer the whole habitable globe. With this view Coblai-kan, after having made himself master of China, sent an army of an hundred thousand men, on board of a thousand vessels called junks, to make the conquest of Japan, and Batou-kan penetrated as far as the frontiers of Italy. Pope Celestine IV. sent four monks to him in the quality of ambassadors, the only set of people who would have accepted such a commission. Friar Asselin relates, that he could only be admitted to speak to one of the Tartar captains, who gave him the following letter for the Pope: "If thou wouldst continue on the face of the earth, come and do homage to us. If thou obeyest not, we know what will be the consequence. Send new deputies to us, to inform us whether thou wilt be our vassal or our enemy."

Charlemagne has been blamed for dividing his dominions among his children; but Genghis-kan ought to be commended. The dominions of Charlemagne were contiguous to each other, had nearly the same laws, the same religion, and might be governed by one prince. Those of Genghis-kan, being much more extensive, intersected by deserts, and divided into different

different religions, could never be long swayed by the same sceptre.

This vast power of the Mogul Tartars, which had been founded about the year 1220, was weakened however on every side, till at length, about a century after this, Tamerlane erected an universal monarchy in Asia, which was also divided into different branches.

The race of Genghis-kan continued a long time in China under the name of Iven. It is probable that the science of astronomy, for which the Chinese were so famous, fell greatly to decay during their revolution; for after that period we find none but Mahometan astronomers in China, and they had almost always the care of regulating the calendar, till the arrival of the Jesuits in that empire. This is perhaps one reason of the mediocrity of the Chinese in this respect.

This is the whole of what is necessary for us to know of the Tartars in those remote ages. Here we meet with no civil nor canon law; no division between the throne, the altar, and the courts of justice; no councils, no universities, nor any of those institutions which have improved or overloaded society among us. The Tartars quitted their deserts about 1212, and in the year 1236 had conquered one half of the hemisphere. This is the whole of their history.

Let us now return to the West, and see what passed in Europe in the thirteenth century.

C H A P. LXI.

Of Charles of Anjou, King of the Two Sicilies.—Of Manfred and Conradine, and of the Sicilian Vespers.

WHILE the great revolution of the Tartars was in its course; while the sons and grandsons of Genghis-kan were sharing the greatest part of the known world; while the crusades were still continuing, and St. Louis unfortunately preparing for his last expedition, the imperial house of Swabia came to be extinct

extinct in a most extraordinary manner: the remainder of this illustrious blood was spilt on the scaffold.

The emperor Frederick II. had been at the same time the sovereign, the vassal and the enemy of the popes: and he paid them homage for Naples and Sicily. His son, Conrad IV. obtained possession of those kingdoms. Every author I have read, assures us, that this Conrad was poisoned by his brother Manfred or Manfred, Frederick's natural son: but I do not see that any of them gives the slightest proof of it. The same emperor Conrad IV. was accused of having poisoned his brother Henry. You will find that in all ages the suspicion of poisoning has been more common than the fact itself.

The homage paid to the court of Rome for the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, was one source of the calamities which befel those provinces, and the imperial houses of Swabia, and of Anjou, which latter, after having stripped the lawful heirs of their right, perished itself in a miserable manner. This homage was at first nothing more than a pious and artful ceremony introduced by the Norman conquerors, who, after the example of many other princes, put their dominions under the protection of the church, in order to stop, if possible, by dread of excommunication, the proceedings of those who wanted to take from them what they had usurped. The popes soon converted this oblation into an homage, and though not masters of Rome, they were lords paramount of the Two Sicilies.

The emperor Frederick II. when he died, left Naples and Sicily in the most flourishing condition. Wise laws properly enforced, new cities built, the capital beautified, and the polite arts in high esteem; these were the monuments of his reign. This kingdom was to have devolved to the emperor Conrad his son. We do not know whether Manfred or Manfred, as we call him, was the lawful son or the bastard of Frederick, but the emperor seems to have considered him in the former light in his will, by which he gave him Tarentum, and several other principalities in sovereignty,

reignty, appointed him regent of the kingdom during the absence of Conrad, and declares him his successor in case Conrad and Henry should die without children. So far every thing appeared peaceable ; but the Italians never willingly obeyed any prince of German extraction ; the popes detested the house of Swabia and wanted to drive them out of Italy ; and the factions of the Guelfs and Gibelins, still continued as strong as ever from one end of Italy to the other. The famous pope Innocent IV. who had deposed the emperor Frederick II. at Lyons, that is to say, who had dared to declare him incapable of reigning, did not fail to assert on this occasion, that the children of an excommunicated person could not succeed to the possession of their father.

Innocent then quitted Naples and hastened to the frontiers of Naples, in order to exhort the barons to yield obedience to Manfred. This bishop fought only with the arms of opinion ; but you have seen what dangerous weapons these were. Manfred did not dare to trust his barons, who were devout, factious, and averse to the house of Swabia. There were still some Saracens remaining in Apulia. His father, the emperor Frederick II. had always kept a guard composed of these Mahometans ; the city of Lucera or Nocera, was filled with these Arabians, insomuch that it had got the name of *Lucera de Pagani*, or the city of pagans, tho' the Mahometans were far from deserving this name which the Italians gave them. No people ever had less of what is improperly called *paganism* in their belief, or were more strongly attached to the pure worship of one God. But this word *pagan* had rendered Frederick II. odious, on account of the number of Arabians he employed in his armies, and made Manfred still more so. Nevertheless Manfred, with the assistance of his Mahometans quelled the revolt, and kept the whole kingdom in awe, the city of Naples excepted, which acknowledged Innocent as its only master. This pope pretended that the Two Sicilies had devolved to him, and were become his property

I

in

in virtue of the words he pronounced when he deposed Frederick II. and his family at the council of Lyons. The emperor Conrad came in person to defend his inheritance, and began with taking the city of Naples; the pope fled to Genoa, his native country, where he contented himself with offering the kingdom to prince Richard, brother to Henry III. king of England, a prince who was not in a condition to fit out a single vessel, and who thanked the holy father for his dangerous present, but declined accepting it.

1254 The unavoidable dissensions between Conrad a German king, and Manfred an Italian, did the court of Rome more service than either the politics or the anathemas of the pope. Conrad died, and it was pretended as I have observed, that he was poisoned. The papal see gave credit to the report. Conrad left the crown of Naples to an infant of only seven years of age. This was the unfortunate Conradine whom we shall see ending his life in a tragical manner. Conradine was in Germany. Manfred was ambitious. He caused it to be reported that Conradine was dead, and made the people take an oath to him as regent in case Conradine was alive, and as king if he was dead. Innocent, who had always on his side, in the kingdom, the faction of the Guelfs, the sworn enemies of the imperial race, and the influence of his excommunications, declared himself king of the Two Sicilies and granted several investitures in that quality. Here, then, we at length see the popes become kings of that country, which had been conquered by Norman gentlemen. This royalty however was but of short duration; the pope indeed, had an army, but he knew not how to command it; he put one of his legates at the head of it; but Manfred and his Mahometans with some barons, who were not quite so scrupulous as the rest, routed the legate and the pontifical army.

It was in this situation of affairs, that pope Innocent finding that he could not get possession of the kingdom of Naples for himself, at length applied to the count of Anjou, brother to St. Louis, and offered him a crown,
of

of which he had no right to dispose, and to which the count had no kind of pretension. But the pope died in the very beginning of this negotiation; and such is generally the end of all those ambitious projects which torment the life of man.

Rinaldo de Signi, who took the name of Alexander IV. succeeded Innocent IV. and adopted all the views of his predecessor. He could not prevail however on the brother of St. Louis, king of France, to enter into his measures. That monarch had unfortunately exhausted his kingdom by his last crusade, and his ransom when in Egypt; and was spending what little he had left in rebuilding the walls of some towns on the coast of Palestine, which were soon afterwards taken from the Christians.

Pope Alexander IV. began his pontificate by summoning Manfred to appear before him. He had a right to do this by the feudal law, that prince being his vassal. But as this right went always with the strongest, it was not to be supposed that a vassal, powerful in arms, would appear at the summons of his lord. Alexander was at Naples, into which he had gained admittance by his intrigues, and from thence he negotiated with his vassal who was in Apulia. Manfred requested the holy father to send a cardinal to treat with him. The court of Rome replied, *id non convenire sanctæ sedis honori, ut cardinales isto modo mittantur*; "That it did not suit with the honour of the holy see to send cardinals in that manner."

The civil war was therefore continued. The pope published a crusade against Manfred, in the same manner as they had been published against the Mussulmen, the emperors and the Albigenses. The distance between Naples and England is considerable, nevertheless this crusade was published there, and a nuncio was sent into that kingdom to collect the tenth penny. This nuncio absolved king Henry III. of the vow he had made to carry the war into Palestine, on his taking another to supply the pope with men and money for his war against Manfred. 1255

Matthew Paris relates that this nuncio raised fifty thousand pounds sterling in England. To see the English at present, one would hardly suppose their ancestors could have been so weak. The court of Rome, in order to extort this money, had flattered the king with hopes of getting the crown of Naples for his son Edmund, and at the same time was treating with Charles of Anjou, being always ready to bestow the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, on whomsoever would bid most for it. All these negotiations however fell to the ground at that time. The pope squandered away the money he had raised in England for a crusade, which after all never took place. Manfred kept his crown, and pope Alexander died without having succeeded in any thing but extorting money from England.

A cobbler being made pope under the name of Urban IV. continued what his predecessors had begun. This cobbler was born at Troyes in Champagne. His predecessor had caused a crusade to be preached in England against the Two Sicilies; this sent to preach one in France, where he distributed his plenary indulgences with a liberal hand, but could raise only a small sum and some few troops, which the count of Flanders, son-in-law to Charles of Anjou, led into Italy. Charles himself accepted the crown of Naples and Sicily, with the consent of St. Louis, king of France; but Urban IV. died before he saw the beginning of this revolution.

Thus did three popes waste their lives in fruitless attempts to dethrone Manfred. Clement IV. who was a Languedocian, and a subject of Charles of Anjou, completed what the others had begun, and had the honour to have his master for his vassal.

The count of Anjou was already possessed of Provence, and a part of Languedoc in right of his wife; and what made great addition to his power, was his having subdued the city of Marseilles. He had likewise a dignity, which a man of abilities had an opportunity of turning to his advantage, namely, his being the only senator of Rome. For the Romans having
always

always defended their liberties against the popes, this dignity of senator had been created about a century before, and was in fact a revival of the power of the ancient tribunes. This senator was at the head of the municipal government, and the popes, who so freely disposed of crowns and kingdoms, could not impose a single tax on the people of Rome. They were then in 1264 Rome, what the elector is now at Cologne. Clement granted his old master the investiture only on condition that he should renounce this dignity at the end of three years, and pay three thousand ounces of gold every year for the feudal dependence of the kingdom of Naples; and that if the payment happened ever to be above two months behind hand, he should be excommunicated. Charles easily agreed to these and to all other conditions: and the pope granted him the tenth penny on the ecclesiastical revenues in France. He 1266 set out with troops and money, was crowned at Rome, and gave battle to Manfred in the plains of Benevento, where he gained a compleat victory, Manfred being killed in the engagement. Charles behaved with great severity after this success, and seemed to have been as cruel, as his brother St. Louis was humane. The pope's legate deprived Manfred's body of Christian burial. Kings take revenge only on the living; but the church extended hers both to the living and the dead.

In the mean time young Conradin, the right heir of the kingdom of Naples, was in Germany during the interregnum, which laid that country waste; and while they were stripping him of the kingdom of Naples, his adherents encouraged him to come and defend his inheritance. He was then only fifteen years old; but his courage was superior to his age. He put himself at the head of an army, in company with the duke of Austria his kinsman, to support his rights. The Romans were for him; so that Conradin, though excommunicated, was received at Rome with the acclamations of the whole people, at the very time that the pope dared not venture to approach his capital.

1268

It may with truth be said, that of all the wars in this century, Conradin's was the most just; and yet it proved the most unfortunate. The pope published a crusade against him, as well as against the Turks; in consequence of which he was defeated and taken prisoner in Apulia, together with his kinsman Frederick, duke of Austria. Charles of Anjou who ought to have honoured them for their courage, caused them to be
1288 condemned by the civil magistrate. The sentence passed upon them was, that they merited death for having taken up arms against the church: and accordingly these two unhappy princes were put to death at Naples by the hands of the public executioner. Pope Clement IV. to whose resentment they seemed to have fallen a sacrifice, did not dare to approve of this barbarity; a barbarity so much the more detestable, as it was attended with the forms of justice. I cannot help being surpris'd, that St. Louis never reprov'd his brother for so base and cruel an action: he whom the Egyptians had spared under a less favourable situation, should surely have condemned the cruelty of Charles of Anjou. The conqueror, instead of keeping fair with the Neapolitans, exasperated them greatly by his oppression; so that both he and his countrymen were held in the utmost horror.

It is the general opinion, that John of Procida, a Sicilian gentleman, disguised in the habit of a Franciscan monk, laid the foundation of that famous conspiracy, by which every Frenchman in the island was to be massacred at the same hour on Easter Sunday, upon ringing the bell for *vespers*. It is certain, that this John of Procida had prepared the minds of the people in Sicily for a revolution; that he had been negotiating at Constantinople and in the kingdom of Arragon; and that Peter, king of Arragon, Manfred's son-in-law, had entered into an alliance with the Greek emperor against Charles of Anjou: but it is not at all probable, that the *Sicilian vespers* was a premeditated conspiracy. If there had been any plot formed, it would have been executed chiefly in the kingdom of Naples; and yet
not

not one Frenchman was killed there. Malaspina relates, that on Easter Monday a native of Provence, named Droguet, was committing a rape upon a woman in Palermo, at the time that the people were going to vespers: the woman cried out; the people flocked to her assistance, and killed the Frenchman. This first emotion of private revenge awakened the general hatred: the Sicilians, excited by John of Procida, and by their own animosity, immediately cried out, that it was necessary to destroy the enemy; upon which they put every Frenchman they found in Palermo to the sword. The same rage and fury possessing the breasts of all the natives, produced the same massacre throughout the whole island. We are told, that they ripped open the bellies of pregnant women, to pluck out the fœtus's as yet unformed; and that the very monks murdered their female penitents of the French nation. It is even said, that only one gentleman of Provence, whose name was des Porcellets, escaped the general slaughter. And yet it is very certain, that the governor of Messina, with all his garrison, withdrew from the island into the kingdom of Naples.

Thus was the blood of Conradin revenged, but not upon those who had spilt it. The Sicilian vespers only brought new misfortunes upon those people, who, living in the happiest climate in the world, seem on that account to have been only the more wicked and unhappy. But it is now time to see what new calamities were produced in this same century by the abuse of the crusades, and the mistaken zeal of religion.

C H A P. LXII.

Of the Crusade against the Languedocians.

THE bloody quarrels betwixt the empire and the priesthood, the riches of the monasteries, and the abuse which so many bishops had made of their temporal

temporal power; all this together could not fail, after a time, to exasperate mankind, and inspire them with a desire of independence. Arnold of Brescia had ventured to stir up even the people of Rome to shake off the yoke. So early as the reign of Charlemagne, people in Europe had begun to reason on the subject of religion. It is very certain that neither the Franks nor the Germans were at that time acquainted either with images, relics, or transubstantiation. After that there were men who would have no other law but the gospel, and who preached up very near the same doctrine as that now held by the Protestants. They were called *Vaudois*, because of the great numbers of them in the valleys of Piedmont; *Albigenses*, from the city of Alby; *good people*, because of the regularity of life which they affected; and, in short, *Manicheans*, which was a general name then given to heretics. To the surprize of every body, the province of Languedoc, towards the end of the twelfth century, seemed to be filled with these people.

So early as the year 1198, pope Innocent III. had deputed two Cistercian monks to try the heretics: "We command, said he, the princes, counts, and all the lords of your province, to assist them with all their might against the heretics, by the authority they have received for the punishment of evil doers; so that after brother Rainier shall have pronounced sentence of excommunication against them, the lords are to confiscate their goods, to banish them from their estates, and to punish them with still greater severity, if they dare to resist. We have therefore given power to brother Rainier, of obliging the lords to comply with these our orders by excommunication, and by an interdict upon their estates, &c." This was the first foundation of the inquisition.

An abbot of Citeaux was afterwards nominated, in conjunction with other monks, to go and execute this office at Toulouse, which should have been done by the bishop. This proceeding provoked the count of Foix, and

and all the lords of the country, who had been already seduced by the reformers, and exasperated against the court of Rome.

This sect consisted chiefly of burghers, reduced to indigence by the long slavery from which they had scarce been freed, and likewise by the crusades. The abbot of Citeaux appeared in the equipage of a prince, and in vain assumed the character of an apostle. While he was preaching to the people, they cried out, " Lay aside either your luxury or your sermon." A Spaniard, bishop of Osma, and who was a very worthy man, being then at Toulouse, advised the inquisitors to lay down their sumptuous equipages, to walk on foot, to live in an austere manner, and to imitate the frugal simplicity of the Albigenes, in order to convert them. St. Dominick, who had accompanied this bishop, joined with him in setting the example of this apostolic life, and seemed at that time to wish that no other weapon should be employed against error. But Peter Castelneau, one of the inquisitors, was accused of having made use of those arms, which suited his character, by privately exciting some of the neighbouring lords against the count of Toulouse, and fomenting a civil war. This inquisitor was assassinated; and the suspicion fell upon the count of Toulouse. 1207

Pope Innocent III. did not scruple to discharge the subjects of the count of Toulouse from their oath of allegiance. In this manner were the descendants of that Raymond of Toulouse treated, who had been the first to serve the cause of Christianity in the expedition of the crusades.

The count being sensible of the effect which a bull was likely to produce, submitted to the satisfaction required of him. One of the pope's legates, named Milon, ordered him to wait upon him at Valence, to deliver up seven castles which he was possessed of in Provence, to perform a crusade against the Albigenes his subjects, and to do public penance. The count was accordingly obedient in every thing. He appeared before the legate naked to the waist, barefooted, and having

having on only a pair of drawers, at the door of St. Giles's church, where a deacon put a rope about his neck, and another whipped him, while the legate held the end of the rope: after this the prince prostrated himself at the entrance of the church while the legate was at dinner.

On the one side appeared the duke of Burgundy, the count of Nevers, Simon count of Montfort, and the bishops of Sens, Autun, Nevers, Clermont, Lisieux, and Bayeux at the head of their troops, with the unfortunate count of Toulouse in the midst of them, in the nature of an hostage. On the other side was seen a multitude of people animated by a religious fanaticism. The city of Beziers attempting to hold out against the crusaders, was taken by storm; the inhabitants having fled for refuge to a church, were all put to the sword, and the town was reduced to ashes. The people of Carcassone, intimidated by this example, submitted to the mercy of the conqueror; upon which their lives were spared, they were permitted to quit the town almost naked, and their goods were confiscated.

The title of *Machabee*, and *Defender of the Church*, was conferred on count Simon of Montfort; who made himself master of a great part of the country, by seizing the castles of the suspected lords, and by attacking those which were not put into his hands, and by pursuing such heretics as ventured to defend themselves. It is related by the ecclesiastical writers, that upon Simon of Montfort's setting fire to the faggots designed for the execution of these unhappy wretches, a hundred and forty of them began to sing psalms, and then threw themselves into the flames. The Jesuit Daniel, in speaking of these unhappy wretches in his history of France, calls them infamous and detestable heretics. But it is evident, that men who thus voluntarily embraced martyrdom, could not be persons of infamous morals. There was certainly nothing detestable in this, but the barbarity with which they were treated, nor any thing infamous but the expressions of father Daniel. We may indeed lament the blindness of these poor
I creatures,

creatures, who imagined that God would make them everlastingly happy, because the monks thought fit to condemn them to the flames.

The spirit of justice and reason, which has since been introduced into the law of nations in Europe, has at length evinced that nothing could be more unjust than this war against the Albigenſes, in which thoſe concerned did not take arms to quell a people who had rebelled againſt their ſovereign, but to compel a ſovereign to deſtroy his people. What ſhould we ſay in theſe days, if a number of biſhops were to beſiege the elector of Saxony or the elector Palatine, on the pretence that the ſubjects of theſe princes performed peaceably certain ceremonies which were not in uſe among the ſubjects of thoſe biſhops?

By thus depopulating Languedoc, they diſtreſſed the count of Toulouſe, who all this while made no defence but by his negotiations. He repaired to St. Giles, to make his court to the legates and abbots, who were at the head of this cruſade, and he wept bitterly in their preſence. They told him that his tears proceeded from fury and deſpair; and the legate gave him his option, either to reſign to Simon of Montfort all the lands which this count had uſurped, or to be excommunicated. The count of Toulouſe had, however, the courage to chuſe the laſt, and fled for refuge to his brother-in-law Peter II. king of Arragon, who undertook his defence, having almoſt as much reaſon as the count himſelf to complain of the leader of this cruſade.

In the mean time the number of cruſaders increaſed, from the avidity of gaining indulgencies and riches. The biſhops of Paris, Liſieux, and Bayeux, repaired to the ſiege of Lavaur, where fourſcore knights, together with the lord of this town, were taken priſoners, and condemned to be hanged; but the gibbet being broke down, they were given up to the fury of the cruſaders, who put them all to the ſword. The ſiſter of the lord of Lavaur was thrown into a well, round which they

burnt three hundred inhabitants who refused to abjure their opinions.

Prince Louis, who was afterwards king Louis VIII. joined indeed with these crusaders, in order to get a share of the spoils; but Simon of Montfort soon got rid of a companion who would have been his master.

It was the interest of the popes to grant this country to Montfort; and the scheme of settling it upon him was so well laid, that the king of Arragon, with all his mediation, could not obtain the least concession in favour of his brother-in-law. He does not appear to have had recourse to arms, till he had failed in every other method.

The battle which this prince fought against the crusaders in the neighbourhood of Toulouse, and in which he himself was slain, was reckoned a most extraordinary affair. We find it asserted by a multitude of writers, ¹²¹³ that Simon of Montfort, with only eight hundred horse and one thousand foot, attacked the army commanded by the king of Arragon and the count of Toulouse, who had then laid siege to Muret. They inform us at the same time, that the king of Arragon had one hundred thousand fighting men, and that there never was a more complete overthrow. They add, that Simon of Montfort, the bishop of Toulouse, and the bishop of Cominge, divided their army into three bodies, in honour of the Holy Trinity.

But is it at all likely, that only eighteen hundred men would attack an army of one hundred thousand in the open field, and divide themselves into three bodies? It is a miracle, some writers will say; but military people, upon reading such a story, will tell them it is an evident absurdity.

The pope, after this victory, held a general council at Rome, whither the count of Toulouse went to sue for pardon. I cannot discover what foundation he had for hoping that his territories would be restored to him: he came off very well in not being deprived of his liberty:

liberty: the council even reckoned it an act of clemency to grant him a pension of four hundred marks, or marques of silver. If they were marks, it was near twenty thousand livres of our present French money; and if marques (*marcas*) about twelve hundred. The latter is most probable, if we consider that the less money was given to him, the more there was remaining for the church.

Upon the death of Innocent III. Raymond of Toulouse did not meet with milder treatment; for he¹²¹⁸ was besieged in his capital by Simon of Montfort. This conqueror, who had done so much mischief, and acquired so much glory, was wounded here by a stone; which put an end to his success, and to his life.

He left a son behind him, on whom the pope conferred all the rights and privileges of the father, but he could not give him the same reputation; and from that time the crusade against Languedoc began to decline. The son of old Raymond, who had succeeded his father, was, like him, also excommunicated. Louis VIII. king of France, obtained a renunciation from young Montfort of all those territories which he was not able to keep: but death put a stop to Louis in the midst of his conquests.

The reign of St. Louis, the ninth of that name, began unhappily by a terrible crusade against Christians who were his vassals. It was not the lot of this prince to acquire any great increase of glory by the crusades. Queen Blanch of Castile, his mother, a woman wholly devoted to the pope, by birth a Spaniard, and consequently abhorring the very name of heretic, and withal guardian to a young prince, who was to share the spoils of the oppressed, did all in her power to assist a brother of Simon of Montfort to complete the ravages of Languedoc. Young Raymond defended himself. The war carried on, resembled that in the Cevennes, which has been already treated of. The priests shewed no mercy to the Languedocians, and these never spared the priests. All the prisoners on both

1227 sides were put to death for the space of two years, and every town that was taken reduced to ashes.

At length the queen regent Blanch, who had other enemies to guard against, and young Raymond, weary of such a scene of slaughter, and unable to support the
1228 expences of the war, concluded a peace at Paris. The cardinal de St. Angelo was chosen arbitrator on the occasion, who imposed the following conditions, which were agreed to and put in execution:

The count of Toulouse was to pay into the hands of a person appointed by the cardinal ten thousand marks, or marques, for the use of the churches of Languedoc; two thousand to the monks of Citeaux, who were already immensely rich; five hundred to the monks of Clervaux, who were still richer than them; and fifteen hundred to the other abbies. He was to go and make war, for five years, against the Saracens and Turks, who most assuredly had never offended him; he was to give up to the king of France, without any equivalent, all his territories on this side the Rhone; for what he possessed on the other side of that river was a fief of the empire. Raymond signed this instrument, which stripped him of all his possessions, and then cardinal de St. Angelo and the pope's legate acknowledged him not only to be then, but always to have been, a good catholic; only they led him for form's sake, in his shirt, and barefooted, before the altar of the church of Notre Dame, in Paris, where he asked forgiveness of the Virgin, probably, in his heart, for having signed so infamous a treaty.

Rome did not forget herself in dividing the spoil. Young Raymond, in order to obtain the remission of his sins, was obliged to cede to the popes in perpetuity the county of Venaissin, which is on the other side of the Rhone. This cession was null by all the laws of the empire; the county was a fief of the empire, and it was not allowable to give up a fief to the church without the consent of the emperor and states. But on such occasions the laws have seldom been attended to.

Not

Not long after this extortion however, the emperor Frederick II. restored this little territory again to the count of Toulouse, and did himself justice as a sovereign who had been grossly affronted. But when afterwards St. Louis, and his son Philip the Bold, took possession of the dominions of the counts of Toulouse, Philip restored the country of Venaissin to the popes, who have preserved it ever since by the generosity of the French monarchs. The city and territory of Avignon were not included. This inheritance fell to the branch of Anjou, which reigned at Naples, and in whose hands it continued till the unfortunate queen Joan of Naples was obliged to transfer it to the popes for the sum of eighty thousand florins, which she never received. Such in general are the titles of possessions, and such was the state of our civil law.

These crusades against Languedoc lasted twenty years. The desire of possessing another's property gave rise to them, and at the same time to the inquisition. This new scourge, before unknown to all the religions in the world, received its first form in 1204, under pope Innocent III. It was established in France in the reign of St. Louis, so early as 1229. A council held at Toulouse in that year began by defending Christian laymen to read the Old and New Testament. It was a downright insult to mankind to dare to say to them, "We will that ye have a certain belief, but we forbade you to read the book on which that belief is founded."

In this council all the works of Aristotle were ordered to be burnt; that is to say, two or three copies of them that had been brought from Constantinople during the first crusades. These were books that no one understood, and on which the heresy of the Languedocians was founded. Succeeding councils have placed Aristotle almost in the same rank with the fathers of the church. Thus you will see, every where, in this great picture of the follies of mankind, the opinions of the clergy, the superstition of the people and fanaticism in general, continually varying, but always
tending

tending to plunge the world into barbarism and misery, till certain academies, or societies of men of learning arose, and made the present age blush for the ignorance of its ancestors.

But it was still worse in 1237, when the king had the weakness to give leave for a grand inquisitor to reside in his kingdom, named by the pope. It was Robert, a Franciscan monk, who exercised this new office, first in Toulouse and afterwards in other provinces.

Had this Robert been only a fanatic, there would have been, at least, the appearance of zeal in his ministry, which might have excused the cruelties he was guilty of in the eyes of the weak and bigotted; but he was an apostate, and carried about with him an abandoned prostitute, whom he entertained as a mistress, and who, to complete the horror of his ministry, was herself an heretic. This is what we find related by Matthew Paris, and what is proved in the *Spicilegium* of Luke d'Acheri.

St. Louis unhappily permitted him to exercise his functions as inquisitor in Paris, Champagne, Burgundy and Flanders. He made the king believe there was a new sect arisen, which privately infested these provinces. On this pretence the inhuman monster condemned to the flames, without mercy, every one whom he thought proper to suspect, and who had not interest or money enough to ransom themselves out of his hands. The common people, who are frequently the best judges of those who impose upon their kings, never gave him any other title than that of Robert the B—, a name applied at that time indiscriminately to sodomites and heretics. At length his infamy and villainies were brought to light; but what will fill you with indignation, is, that he was only condemned to perpetual imprisonment, and to increase your indignation, you will find, that Father Daniel makes no mention of this man in his *History of France*.

In this manner then did the inquisition first begin in Europe; a beginning truly worthy of the institution itself. You are doubtless fully sensible, that it must
be

be the height of brutal and absurd barbarism to maintain by the means of informers and executioners, the religion of a God, who died by the hands of executioners. It is almost as contradictory as to amass for one's own private use all the riches of a prince and his people, in the name of a God who was born and lived in poverty. We shall see in the course of this work, what cruelties have been committed by the inquisition of Spain and other countries, and how much the barbarity and rapacity of some men have abused the simplicity of others.

C H A P. LXIII.

The State of Europe in the thirteenth Century.

WE have seen how the crusades exhausted Europe of men and money, without improving society. Germany had been in a state of anarchy ever since the death of Frederick II. The several great lords had appropriated to themselves the public revenue of the empire; so that when Rodolphus of Habsburg was elected emperor in 1273, they would grant him only a few troops, with which he wrested Austria from Ottocares, who had taken it from the house of Bavaria.

It was during the interregnum that preceded the election of Rodolphus, that Denmark, Poland and Hungary, got entirely rid of the small tribute which they paid to the emperors, when the latter were powerful enough to exact it.

It was also at this same period that several cities established their municipal government, which still subsists. They entered into an alliance to defend themselves against the encroachments of the great lords. The Hanse towns, as Lubeck, Cologne, Brunswick, Dantzick, to which eighty more acceded afterwards, formed a commercial republic, dispersed among different states. The Austregues were established; these
are

are conventional arbitrators between the princes and nobility, as well as the imperial towns: they supply the place of the courts and laws that were wanting in Germany.

A new plan of government was beginning to take place in Italy before the time of Rodolphus, and during his reign several of the cities asserted their freedom, which he confirmed for pecuniary considerations. It seems as if Italy might at that time have been entirely separated from Germany.

All the German nobility, in order to increase their power, were desirous of having a weak emperor. The four temporal princes, and the three archbishops, who by degrees engrossed the right of election intirely to themselves, had, in concert with some others, agreed to chuse Rodolphus of Habsburg for their emperor, merely because he had no extensive dominions. He was a Swiss lord, who had made himself formidable, as one of those chiefs to whom the Italians gave the name of *condottieri*, or *leaders*. He had been a champion to the abbot of St. Gal, against the bishop of Basil, in a quarrel about some tuns of wine: he had likewise assisted the town of Strasburg. So great was the disproportion between his fortune and courage, that he had been for some time master of the household to that same Ottocares king of Bohemia, who, upon his pressing him afterwards to yield homage, made answer, *That he owed him nothing; for he had paid him his wages*. Little did the princes of Germany foresee, that this same Rodolphus would be the founder of a family, the most flourishing in Europe, and which has been more than once very near attaining the same height in power as Charlemagne. This power was long a forming; particularly towards the end of this thirteenth century, and the beginning of the fourteenth, the empire had no manner of influence in Europe.

France would have been happy under such a sovereign as St. Louis, had it not been for the fatal prejudice of the crusades, which were productive of so many misfortunes to the nation, and at length occa-

sioned his death on the sands of Africa. By the great number of vessels fitted out for those unfortunate expeditions, it appears that France might easily have established an extensive commerce. The statutes of St. Louis relative to trade, his establishing a new police in Paris, his pragmatic sanction which secured the discipline of the Gallican church, his four bailiwicks, to whose jurisdiction the courts of his vassals were subject, and which are the origin of the parliament of Paris, his regulations and exactness in regard to the coin, all together shews that France might have been rendered at that time a flourishing kingdom.

In regard to England it enjoyed as much happiness under Edward I. as the manners of the time would permit. This prince united Wales to his dominions, and subdued Scotland, which received a king of his appointing. It is true the English were no longer possessed of Normandy nor Anjou; but they had almost all Guienne. If Edward I. had only a cursory war with France, it was owing to his being so much employed at home, either when he subdued Scotland, or when he afterwards lost it.

Spain, which we left long ago a prey to the Saracens, will be the subject of a separate and more copious article. At present we shall content ourselves with saying a word or two concerning Rome.

Towards the thirteenth century, the papacy continued in the same state in which it had been for many years. The popes were not well settled in Rome, had only a tottering authority in Italy, were hardly masters of a few towns in the patrimony of St. Peter, and in Umbria; still they continued to bestow kingdoms, and to be the umpires of kings.

Pope Nicholas, in 1289, solemnly determined at Rome the disputes between the king of Portugal and his clergy. We have seen how in 1283 pope Martin IV. deposed the king of Arragon, and gave away his territories to the king of France, who was not powerful enough to execute the pope's bull. Boniface VIII.

gave Sardinia and Corfica to another king of Arragon, James, furnamed the Just.

Towards the year 1300, when a contest arose concerning the succession to the kingdom of Scotland, pope Boniface VIII. wrote thus to king Edward: "You ought to know that it is my place to appoint a king of Scotland, which has always in full right belonged, and still belongeth to the church of Rome: but if you pretend to have any right thereto, I desire you would send your agents to us, and we will do you justice; for we reserve this affair to ourselves."

Towards the end of the thirteenth century, when some of the German princes deposed Adolphus of Nassau, successor to the first prince of the house of Austria, and elected Albert of Austria, Rodolphus's son, they trumped up the pope's bull for deposing Nassau, which was indeed transferring their own power to the pope. The same Boniface, no sooner heard of Albert's being
1298 chosen, than he wrote thus to the electors: "We order you to proclaim publicly, that Albert, who styles himself king of the Romans, shall come and appear before us, to answer to the charge of high treason, and of excommunication incurred."

It is very well known, that Albert of Austria instead of appearing to this summons, defeated and killed Nassau in a battle fought in the neighbourhood of Spire; and that Boniface, after having been so profuse of his excommunications against that prince, was as liberal of his benedictions to him in 1303, when the holy father stood in need of his assistance, in the contest between him and Philip the Fair. Then, by the plenitude of his power he supplied the irregularity of Albert's election, by conferring upon him the kingdom of France, "Which, by right"—said he in his bull—"belongs to the emperors." Thus do mankind regulate their behaviour by their interest, and employ every means sacred or profane to attain their end.

Other crowned heads likewise submitted tamely to the papal jurisdiction. Mary, wife of Charles king of Naples, and pretender to the kingdom of Hungary, had

had her cause tried before the pope and his cardinals; and the pope adjudged the kingdom to this princess, by default, or for want of the other party's appearing in court. Nothing more was wanting but an army to put this sentence into execution.

In 1339, Christopher, king of Denmark, having been deposed by his nobles and clergy, Magnus, king of Sweden, sent to the pope and asked of him Scania and some other territories. "You know most holy Father"—said he in his letter to the pontiff—"that the kingdom of Denmark depends altogether on the church of Rome, to whom it pays tribute, and not on the empire." This pontiff, to whom the king of Sweden was a suitor, and whose temporal jurisdiction over all the princes of the earth, he so fully acknowledges, was James Fournier, Benedict XII. who then resided at Avignon. The name however is not material; the question is to shew that every prince who has a mind to usurp or recover any dominions, always addressed himself to the pope as his master. Benedict sided with the king of Denmark, and returned for answer to the above letter, "That he should not proceed against that prince, till he had summoned him to appear before him, agreeable to the ancient customs."

France, as we shall see presently, did not pay the same deference to Boniface VIII. It is very well known that this pontiff instituted the Jubilee, and added a second crown to the pontifical tiara, to signify the two powers. John XXII. topped them afterwards with a third. But John had not two naked swords carried before him, as Boniface had when he granted indulgences.

In this thirteenth century, men passed from a state of brutal, to a state of scholastic ignorance. Albert surnamed the Great, taught the principles of heat, cold, dryness and moisture; he also taught politics according to the rules of astrology, and the influence of the planets; and morality, according to Aristotle's logic. It has often happened, that the wisest institutions have

arisen from blindness and weakness. There is not a more noble and splendid ceremony belonging to the church, nor one better calculated to inspire the common people with a religious awe, than the festival of the holy sacrament. Antiquity could not boast any thing equal to it, and yet from whence had it its rise? A nun of Liege, whose name was Moncornillon, dreamt every night that she saw a hole in the moon; she had afterwards a vision in which she was told that the moon signified the church, and the hole a festival which was wanting in the church. Upon this, a monk named John, assisted her in composing the office of the holy sacrament; the festival was established at Liege, and in a short time Urban IV. adopted it for the whole Christian church.

In the twelfth century, the black and white monks formed two great factions, which divided the towns in the same manner as the blue and green factions did the minds of the people in the Roman empire. However, in the thirteenth century, when the mendicant friars began to grow into credit, the whites and blacks united against these new comers, till at length one half of Europe was raised against them all. The studies of the schools were then, and indeed are at present, such systems of absurdity, as were they to be imputed to the inhabitants of Trapobania, we should think those people belied. They disputed, “Whether God can
 “ produce the universal nature of things, and preserve
 “ it without there being things? Whether God can
 “ be in a predicate sense? Whether he can communi-
 “ cate his creating power, or render what he has made
 “ not made, and change a married woman into a vir-
 “ gin? Whether each person in the Godhead can
 “ assume which of the three natures he pleases? Whether
 “ God can be a beetle or a grass-hopper? Whether God
 “ the Father produces the Son by intellect, or by will;
 “ by essence, or by attribute; naturally, or of his free
 “ will?” And the doctors who resolved these questions called themselves the great, the subtle, the angelic, the irrefragable, the solemn, the enlightened, the univer-
 fal,

fal, and the profound. These doctors were to the ancient fathers, what a pretender to wit is to a man of solid learning.

C H A P. LXIV.

Of Spain, in the twelfth and thirteenth Centuries.

WHEN the Cid had driven the Mussulmen out of Toledo and Valentia, towards the end of the eleventh century, Spain was divided into several governments. The kingdom of Castile included the two Castiles, Leon, Galicia and Valentia. The kingdom of Arragon was at that time reunited to Navarre. Andalusia, part of Murcia and Granada, belonged to the Moors. Barcelona was subject to its own count, who paid homage to the king of Arragon. A third part of Portugal was under a Christian government.

This third part of Portugal was only a county. The son of a duke of Burgundy, descended from Hugh Capet, and who was stiled count Henry, made himself master of that province at the latter end of the twelfth century.

A crusade would have been more likely to drive the Mahometans out of Spain than Syria: but in all probability the Christian princes of Spain did not approve of such dangerous succours; but chose rather to harraß their country themselves, and dispute it with the Moors, than to see it invaded by crusaders.

Alphonso, surnamed the *Warriour*, king of Arragon¹¹³⁹ and Navarre, drove the Moors out of Saragossa, which became the capital of Arragon, and returned no more under the dominion of the Mussulmen.

The son of count Henry, whom I call Alphonso of Portugal, to distinguish him from so many other princes of that name, expelled the Moors from Lisbon, the¹¹⁶⁹ best port in Europe, and from all Portugal, but not
from

from the province of Algarves. He gained several battles, and was at length crowned king of Portugal.

This event is of great importance. The kings of Castile at that period still continued to stile themselves emperors of Spain. Alphonso, count of a part of Portugal, was their vassal while he was weak; but no sooner had he rendered himself master by dint of arms of a considerable province, than he erected himself into an independent sovereign. The king of Castile made war against him as a rebellious vassal; but the new king of Portugal submitted himself and his crown to the holy see, in like manner as the Normans became vassals to Rome for the kingdom of Naples. Eugenius III. accordingly conferred the kingly dignity on Alphonso and his posterity, on condition of his paying an annual tribute of two pounds weight of gold to the court of Rome. Pope Alexander III. confirmed the donation of his predecessor on condition of the same payment. These popes then actually disposed of kingdoms. The estates of Portugal being assembled at Lamego, by Alphonso, in order to frame laws for the government of his new kingdom, began by reading the bull of Eugenius III. which bestowed the crown on Alphonso, and which of course they considered as the principal right of the sovereignty. This is an additional proof of the customs and prejudices of those times. No new prince dared to assume the title of sovereign, nor could be acknowledged such by other sovereigns, without the permission of the pope; and the basis of all the history of the middle age is always, that the popes looked upon themselves as lords paramount of every state, without exception, in virtue of being the pretended successors of Jesus Christ; and the German emperors, on their side, pretended to think and allowed their chancellors to declare publicly, that the several kingdoms of Europe were only branches that had been torn from their empire because they pretended to be successors to the Cæsars. In the mean time the Spaniards were employed in establishing more real rights.

Had the Christians but exerted themselves a little more, the Mussulmen would have been driven out of this country; but union was wanting, and the Spanish Christians were ever at variance. At one time Castile and Arragon were up in arms; at another Navarre was fighting against Arragon; sometimes these three provinces waged war against one another, all at the same time, and each of them were often rent by intestine commotions. There were three kings of Arragon in succession, who joined the greatest part of Navarre to that kingdom, while the remainder was occupied by the Mahometans. Alphonso the Warrior, who died in 1134, was the last of those princes. We may form an idea of the spirit of the times, and of the badness of the government, by the will of that monarch, who left his kingdoms to the knights Templars and the knights of Jerusalem. This was leaving behind him the seeds of a civil war. By good luck those knights did not attempt to support the will. The states of Arragon, continuing to be free, chose for their king Don Raymer, brother of their deceased sovereign, though he had been a monk upwards of forty years, and for some time a bishop. He was called the *Priestly King*, and the pope granted him a dispensation to marry.

Navarre was divided from Arragon during these 1134 transactions, and became once more a separate kingdom, which devolved afterwards, by marriage, on the counts of Champagne, and belonged to Philip the Fair, and the house of France, till it fell at length to the families of Foix and Albert, and is now absorbed in the Spanish monarchy.

Mean while the Moors maintained their ground, and 1158 retook Valentia. Their incursions gave rise to the order of Calatrava. The Cistercian monks having sufficient revenues to defray the expence of defending the city of Calatrava, armed some of their lay-brethren, together with several esquires, who fought against the Moors with a scapulary over their shoulders. Soon after was formed this order, which is neither military
nor

nor religious; the knights of which are allowed to marry once, and which consists only in the enjoyment of several commanderies in Spain.

The disputes among the Christians still continued, and the Mahometans sometimes took advantage of these quarrels. Towards the year 1197, a king of Navarre, whose name was don Sancho, being persecuted by the Castilians and the Arragonians, was forced to go over to Africa, to implore the assistance of the Miramolin of the empire of Morocco; but this step, which seemed likely to produce a revolution, had no such effect.

Heretofore, when all Spain was united under king Roderick, a brave, though perhaps incontinent prince, it was subdued in less than two years: and now, that it was divided into so many jealous principalities, neither the Miramolins of Africa, nor the Moorish king of Andalusia, could make any impression upon it. The reason is, the Spaniards were grown more warlike, the country was thick set with fortresses, the princes would unite in case of any great danger, and in a word, the Mahometans were not more prudent than the Christians.

1200 At length all the Christian princes of Spain entered into an alliance, to oppose the forces that were ready to fall upon them from Africa.

The Miramolin, Mahomed-Ben-Joseph, had crossed the sea with near one hundred thousand men, if we are to credit the accounts of historians, who seldom fail to exaggerate on these occasions. In reading history it is generally necessary to guard against such exaggeration in the number of troops brought into the field, the number of the killed, the treasures expended, and the wonders that are related. The Miramolin, however, having reinforced his army with the Moors of Andalusia, reckoned he should be able to conquer Spain. The report of this great armament awakened the attention of some French knights. The common danger united the kings of Castile, Arragon, and

1212 Navarre. Portugal furnished troops. Those two great
armies

armies met each other in the defiles of the Black Mountain, on the confines of Andalusia, and the province of Toledo. The archbishop of Toledo was with the king of Castile, Alphonso the Noble, and carried the standard of the cross at the head of the troops. The Miramolin held a sabre in one hand, and the koran in the other. The Christians were victorious; and this day is solemnized every year at Toledo on the sixteenth of July: but the victory was productive of more glory than real advantage. The Moors of Andalusia were strengthened with the remains of the African army, while the Christian forces were soon disbanded.

It was the custom in those days for almost all the knights that bore arms, to return to their respective homes after a battle. They knew how to fight, but they did not understand the art of war; and the Moors were less skilled in it than the Spaniards. There were no standing armies either among the Mussulmen or the Christians.

During the space of five hundred years, Spain had been so engaged in her own affairs, that she did not begin to trouble herself with the rest of Europe, till the time of the Albigenes. We have seen how Peter I. king of Arragon, was obliged to assist his vassals of Languedoc and the country of Foix, who were oppressed under the pretence of religion; and how he died fighting against Montfort, who had taken away his son, and conquered Languedoc. His widow, Mary of Montpellier, who had retired to Rome, pleaded this son's cause before Innocent III. and beseeched him to interpose his authority that he might be set at liberty. There have been some conjunctures very honourable for the court of Rome. The pope ordered Simon of Montfort to restore the child to the Arragonians; and Montfort restored him. If the popes had always made the same use of their authority, they would have been the legislators of Europe.

This very king James was the first of the kings of Arragon, to whom the states took the oath of alle-

giance. It was he who took the island of Majorca
1238 from the Moors, and likewise dispossessed them of the beautiful kingdom of Valentia, a country favoured by nature, where the natives are strong, healthful, and robust, and every thing conspires to please the senses. It seems strange that so many historians should agree in asserting that Valentia was only a thousand paces in circumference, and yet that no less than fifty thousand Mahometans marched out of that city. How was it possible for so small a place to contain such a number of inhabitants?

This period seemed to be destined for the glory of
1236 Spain, and the expulsion of the Moors. Ferdinand III. king of Castile and Arragon, dispossessed them of the famous city of Cordova, the residence of their first kings, a city far superior to Valentia, and where they had built a most magnificent mosque, besides a multitude of fine palaces.

This same Ferdinand III. subdued also the Moors of Murcia, a small but fruitful country, in which they bred a vast number of silk worms, and had very good silk manufactures. At length, after a siege of sixteen
1248 months, he made himself master of Seville, the most opulent city belonging to the Moors, and which they
1252 never recovered afterwards. Death put an end to his prosperities. If an apotheosis be due to those who have delivered their country from slavery, Spain surely has as much reason to revere the memory of Ferdinand, as France has to invoke St. Louis. Like the king of France he enacted wise laws, and like him also, he established new courts of judicature. He is said to have
1248 erected the royal council of Castile, which has subsisted ever since.

1252 He had for his minister Ximenez, archbishop of Toledo, a fortunate name to Spain, but no way related to that other Ximenez, who, some time after, was regent of Castile.

At that time Castile and Arragon were powerful states, but we must not imagine that their sovereigns were absolute; there was not one absolute prince in Europe.

Europe. The Spanish lords reduced the authority of their kings to narrower bounds than those of any other sovereign. The Arragonians still remember the formula of the inauguration of their kings. The grand justiciary of the kingdom pronounced the following words in the name of the states: "*Nos que valemus tanto como vos, y que podemos mas que vos, os haxemos nuestro rey y senor, con tal que gardeis neustros fueros, se no, no.*" "We who are as good as you, and who can do more than you, do constitute you our king, provided you keep our laws, otherwise not."

The grand justiciary pretended that this was not an empty ceremony, but that he had a right to accuse the king of any crime in the presence of the states, and to preside in court upon pronouncing his sentence. I do not find however that this privilege was ever exerted.

The privileges enjoyed by Castile were no way inferior to those we have related, and the states set the same limits to the supreme power. In short, it is reasonable to think, that in countries abounding with such numerous nobility, it was as difficult for the kings to enslave their subjects as to expel the Moors.

Alphonso, surnamed the Astronomer, or the Wise, son of St. Ferdinand, experienced the truth of this maxim. It is said of him, that while he was studying the heavens he lost the earth. This trivial reflection would be just, had Alphonso neglected his affairs for study; but this he never did. The same good understanding which raised him to be a great philosopher, made him likewise a very good king. Several writers charge him with atheism for saying, that "had he been one of God's privy council, he would have given some advice in regard to the motions of the planets." These writers do not consider that this pleasantry of this wise prince was levelled entirely at Ptolemy's system, with the insufficiency and absurdities of which he was thoroughly acquainted. He rivalled the Arabians in science, and the university of Salamanca, which was founded by his father, had not his

equal. The Alphonfine tables are still a monument of his glory, to the shame of those princes, who take a pride in being ignorant; but we must likewise acknowledge that they were drawn up by Arabians.

The difficulties which embarrassed his reign were surely not a consequence of the sciences, which rendered the name of Alphonso so illustrious, but of the vast expences of his father. For as St. Louis had exhausted France by his voyages, so Ferdinand had for a time ruined Castile, even by his acquisitions, which at that time cost more than they were worth.

After the death of St. Ferdinand, his son was obliged to withstand Navarre and Arragon, which were grown jealous of his power.

Yet all these difficulties which surrounded this philosophical king did not hinder the princes of the empire from offering him the imperial crown; and his not being raised to that dignity, when Rodolphus of Habsburg was elected in his stead, ought, in my opinion, to be solely attributed to the great distance which separated Castile from Germany. Alphonso shewed at least that he merited the imperial diadem, by his manner of governing Castile. His book of laws, entitled *Las Partidas*, is still one of the foundations of Spanish jurisprudence. In this code he says, that "The despotic monarch tears up the tree, and the wise monarch prunes it."

- 1283 He lived to see his son Sancho III. rebel against him in his old age: but the iniquity of the son is not, I think, any disgrace to the father. This don Sancho was by a second wife, and wanted, in his father's lifetime, to be declared heir to the crown, to the prejudice of the grand-children by the first venter. A factious assembly, who pretended to be the states, gave him the crown. This outrage is a further proof of what I have often affirmed, that there were no laws about this time in Europe, but that all things were determined according to occasional considerations, and the caprice of mankind.

Alphonso

Alphonso the Wise was reduced to the hard necessity of entering into a league with the Mahometans against his son and the rebellious Christians. This was not the first alliance of the kind, but it was certainly the most just.

The Miramolin of Morocco, at the invitation of king Alphonso X. crossed the sea. The African and Castilian monarchs met at Zara on the confines of Granada. The behaviour and discourse of the Miramolin, ought to be perpetuated in history. Having yielded the most honourable place to the king of Castile, "I treat you in this manner, said he, because you are unfortunate; and I join my troops with yours, merely to avenge the cause of all kings and all fathers." Alphonso fought against his son, and defeated him, which still proves how deserving he was to reign: but he died soon after his victory.

1284

The king of Morocco was obliged to return to his dominions, and don Sancho, the unnatural son of Alphonso, continued to enjoy the crown, which he had usurped from his nephews, and his reign was happy.

The Portuguese dominions at that time included the province of Algarves, which had been wrested at length from the Moors. The word *Algarves* signifies, in Arabic, a fertile country. Let us not forget that Alphonso the Wise, assisted Portugal greatly in making this conquest. All this, I apprehend, tends to prove that Alphonso never had any reason to repent his having cultivated the sciences, as some historians would fain insinuate, who give themselves the air of politicians, by affecting to condemn the arts which they ought rather to respect.

So far was Alphonso the Philosopher from forgetting his temporal interest, that he made pope Gregory X. grant him a third part of the tenths of Leon and Castile, a right which he transmitted to his successors.

His family met with disturbances; but they maintained their ground against the Moors. His grandson Ferdinand IV. dispossessed them of Gibraltar, which was not so hard to take then, as it is now.

This

This Ferdinand IV. is called *Ferdinand the Summoned*, because he is said to have ordered in a hurry of passion two noblemen to be thrown down from a rock, who, before his commands were executed, summoned him to appear before God in thirty days, and that he died in that time. We could wish that this story was true, or at least that it was looked upon as such by those, who believe they have a right to do every thing with impunity. He was father of the famous Peter the Cruel, whose excessive severities we shall see presently; an unrelenting prince, who exercised the most tyrannical barbarities upon mankind, without being summoned to the tribunal of the Almighty.

Arragon on the other hand began to acquire strength, as we have already seen, and its power was increased by the addition of Sicily.

The popes pretended that they had a right to dispose of the kingdom of Arragon, for two reasons; first, because they looked upon it as a fief of the holy see; secondly, because Peter III. surnamed *the Great*, who was charged with being concerned in the Sicilian vespers, was excommunicated, not for any hand he had had in that massacre, but for having seized on Sicily, which the court of Rome did not chuse he should enjoy. The kingdom of Arragon was therefore transferred by the pope's sentence to Charles of Valois, grandson of St. Louis. But the bull could never be put in execution. The house of Arragon prospered greatly; and not long after, the popes who had been so eager to destroy it, contributed to its grandeur. Boniface VIII. 1194 gave Sardinia and Corsica to the king of Arragon, James IV. called the Just, to prevent the Genoese and the Pisans from disputing any further about those islands.

An alliance took place at that time between Castile and France, because they were enemies to Arragon. In this alliance the princes and subjects on both sides were heartily united.

What passed at that time in France, in the reign of Philip the Fair, and the beginning of the fourteenth century, is well worth our attention.

C H A P.

C H A P. LXV.

Of Philip the Fair, King of France, and Boniface VIII.

THE reign of Philip the Fair, who ascended the throne in 1285, forms a remarkable epoch in the history of France, by the admission of the third estate into the national assemblies, by the institution of the supreme courts of judicature called parliaments, by the first erection of a new peerage in favour of the duke of Britany, by the suppression of duels in civil matters, and by the law of appanages restrained only to male heirs. We shall confine ourselves at present to two other articles, the quarrel between Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII. and the suppression of the order of the Templars.

We have already observed that Boniface VIII. of the family of the Cajetans, was a man of the same stamp as Gregory VII. more learned indeed than Gregory in the canon law, but not less zealous to subject the temporal powers to the church, and all churches whatever to the holy see. Italy was more than ever a prey to the factions of the Guelfs and Gibelines. The Gibelines were originally the adherents of the emperor; but as the empire at that time was only an empty name, the Gibelines still made use of this name to strengthen themselves and to increase their own power. Boniface had been long a Gibeline when only a private person; but you may easily imagine he was a Guelf, when raised to the pontifical throne. It is said that the first day of Lent, as he was giving the ashes to the archbishop of Genoa, he flung them in his face, saying to him, *Remember thou art a Gibeline*, instead of, *Remember thou art man*. The house of Colonna, who were the chief barons of Rome, and lords of several towns in the patrimony of St. Peter, were of the Gibeline faction. Their interest in regard to the popes was the same as that of the German lords in regard to the emperor, or of the French

French nobility in respect to the king of France. The power of the lords of fiefs clashed every where with the sovereign authority.

The other barons in the neighbourhood of Rome were in the same circumstances: they joined with the kings of Sicily, and with the Gibelines of the several towns in Italy. We must not therefore be surprised, if the pope was a persecutor, and was persecuted in his turn. Almost all those lords had at the same time diplomas of *vicars of the holy see*, and of *vicars to the empire*, this was an inevitable source of civil broils, which the respect for religion could never extinguish, and which the haughtiness of Boniface VIII. served only to increase.

These violent proceedings did not end without much greater outrages, which were committed an hundred years after by Alexander IV. The see of Rome in the reign of Boniface VIII. was no longer possessed of all that country, which had been held by Innocent III. from the Adriatic to the harbour of Ostia. The popes pretended to the supreme jurisdiction, and had the lordship of some towns: but upon the whole their power might be said to be very limited. The great revenue of the supreme pontiffs consisted in the contributions raised on the universal church, in the tenths frequently raised upon the clergy, in dispensations, and various taxes.

In this situation of things, Boniface ought to have carried himself fair with a prince, who had it in his power to deprive him of part of those revenues, and to strengthen his enemies the Gibelines. And indeed even at the first breaking out of the quarrel between him and the king of France, he invited Charles of Valois, Philip's brother, into Italy, who came with a few troops: he made this prince marry the granddaughter of Baldwin the Second, the dethroned emperor of Constantinople, and he solemnly nominated Valois emperor of the East: so that in two years time he disposed of the empires of the East and West, with the kingdom of France; for we have already observed,

that in 1303, this pope, upon his being reconciled to Albert of Austria, made him a present of France. Of these three donations only that of the empire of Germany was accepted, because Albert was actually in possession of it.

The pope, before his reconciliation with the emperor, had conferred another title on Charles of Valois, that of *vicar of the empire* in Italy, but especially in Tuscany. He thought, that since he named the masters, he had still a stronger right to appoint the vicars. It was with a view to gratify the pope, that Charles of Valois persecuted the Ghibeline party at Florence with great fury. And yet at the very time that Charles was doing him this service, Boniface treated his brother the king of France with the greatest indignity. There cannot be a more convincing proof that passion and animosity will frequently get the better even of interest itself.

Philip the Fair, who wanted to spend a great deal of money, though he had but little of his own, pretended that the clergy, as the richest order of the state, ought to contribute towards the public supplies without asking leave from Rome. The pope wanted the tenth penny which had been granted for the relief of the holy land, though it was no longer capable of relief, and was subject to a descendant of Genghis-kan; but the king took the money to himself, to carry on the war in Guienne, in which he was engaged in 1301 and 1302 against Edward king of England. Such was the first occasion of the quarrel, which was afterwards inflamed to a very high pitch by the insolence of a bishop of the city of Pamiers. This man had entered into a cabal against the king in his own province, which was then subject to the jurisdiction of the crown; and the pope soon afterwards appointed him legate to the French court. This person being thus invested with a dignity, which, in the opinion of the court of Rome, made him at least the king's equal, came to Paris to defy his sovereign, and threatened to suspend the celebration of divine service throughout his kingdom. If a layman

had behaved in this manner, he would have been put to death; but the king found it necessary to act with the greatest precaution and tenderness, even in arresting the person of the bishop: and after all, he was obliged to deliver him up into the hands of his metropolitan the archbishop of Narbonne.

You may already have observed that, after the death of Charlemagne, there was not one pontiff who had not some intricate and violent dispute with the emperors and kings. You will see likewise, that those disputes, which are the necessary consequences of the most absurd form of government, to which mankind ever submitted, continued till the age of Louis XIV. This absurdity consisted in making a foreigner master at home, and in absolutely permitting him to dispose of fiefs in your own country; in not being able to receive any part of the revenue of those fiefs without the permission of this foreigner, and admitting him to share in them; in being continually exposed to see those very temples, which you yourself built and endowed, shut up by his orders, and in consenting that one part of your subjects, should be obliged to go and plead their cause at the distance of three hundred leagues from their own country. These however, are only a small part of those fetters with which the sovereigns of Europe insensibly, and almost without knowing it, loaded themselves and their subjects. It is certain, that if any one in these times were to propose to a sovereign, or his council, to submit to such customs, he would be considered as a mad-man. The yoke which at first appeared light, became every day more burthensome, till at length it was found necessary to alleviate it, but mankind had neither wisdom, knowledge, nor resolution enough to throw it off altogether.

The bishop of Rome, Boniface VIII. in a bull which had been a long time famous, had decreed, "That no person in holy orders was to pay any thing to the king his master, without the express permission of the sovereign pontiff." Philip, king of France, did not dare immediately to order the bull to be burnt; and therefore

therefore contented himself with issuing an ordinance, prohibiting the carrying of money out of the kingdom, without making any mention of Rome therein. Negotiations were set on foot upon this occasion; the pope, to gain time, canonized St. Louis; and from thence the monks concluded that the man who could thus dispose of a place in heaven, might equally well dispose of the riches of the earth.

The king pleaded before the archbishop of Narbonne at Senlis, against the bishop of Pamiers, by the mouth of his chancellor, Peter Flotte; and the chancellor went in person to Rome to lay before the pope an account of the proceedings. The kings of Cappadocia and Bythinia were used to act in the same manner towards the Roman republic; but Peter Flotte did more than them, for he spoke to the pope as the minister of a real sovereign to an imaginary one; expressing himself in these very words; "That the kingdom of France was of this world, but that of the pope's was not."

The pope had the presumption to take offence at this, and wrote a brief to the king, in which he thus expresses himself: "Know that you are subject to us in temporal as well as spiritual matters." A judicious and learned historian remarks very aptly, that this brief was preserved in an ancient manuscript in the library of St. Germain des Prés at Paris, but that the leaf has been torn out; there is still however remaining a table of contents that points out the place where it was, and an extract, which preserves the remembrance of it.

To this letter Philip returned the following answer: "To Boniface, the pretended pope, little or no health; be it known to your supreme vanity, that we are in subjection to no one in temporal matters." The historian before alluded to observes, that this answer of the king's is preserved in the Vatican. This shews that the modern Romans have been more curious in preserving curious things than the Benedictines of Paris. Some have vainly disputed the authenticity of these letters; I do not suppose that they were ever sent with

the usual formalities or presented in form, but there is not the least doubt of their having been written.

The pontiff threw out bulls upon bulls, all asserting the pope to be master of all kingdoms; and that the king of France, if he did not forthwith yield obedience to him, should be excommunicated, and his kingdom put under an interdict, that is to say, a total stop put to all the duties of Christianity, even to baptism and the burial of the dead. It appears the height of contradiction the mind of man can be capable of, that a Christian bishop, who pretends that all of the same faith are his subjects, should want to hinder these pretended subjects from being Christians, and thus deprive himself at once of what he considers as his own property. But you will easily perceive that the pope depended on the weakness of mankind in general, and flattered himself that the French would be pusillanimous enough to sacrifice their king to the dread of being deprived of the sacraments; but here he was mistaken.

1303 The French burnt this bull, and the whole kingdom took up arms against the pope, but without rejecting the papal authority. The king then assembled the states. But was it necessary to convoke such an assembly, merely to decide that Boniface VIII. was not king of France?

Cardinal le Moine, a Frenchman by birth, but who had now no other country than Rome, came to Paris in order to negotiate; and if he could not succeed, to excommunicate the kingdom. This new legate had orders to bring the king's confessor, a Dominican friar, with him to Rome, that he might give an account of his own conduct, as well as of the king's. Every thing that the human mind could invent to elevate the power of the pope, was on this occasion exhausted: the bishops were all submissive to him; new orders of religious men, immediately depending on the holy see, had every where erected his standard: Philip was a prince who confessed his most secret thoughts, or at least was supposed to confess them to one of those monks; in fine, this confessor was summoned by the pope

pope his master to come and give an account at Rome of the conscience of his penitent. And yet Philip did not yield, but seized on the temporalities of all the absent prelates. The states of the kingdom appealed to a future general council, and to a future pope; a remedy which even betrayed some weakness. For to appeal to the pope was acknowledging his authority: and what occasion have mankind for either council or pope, to know that all governments are independent, and that we ought to obey only the laws of our own country?

The pope immediately deprived all the ecclesiastical bodies of France of the right of election, and the universities of the right of conferring degrees, and even of teaching, as if he revoked a gift of his own granting. These arms were but weak; he therefore wanted to strengthen them with the forces of the German empire.

You have seen the popes give away the empire, Portugal, Hungary, Denmark, England, Arragon, Sicily, and almost every other kingdom. That of France had not as yet been transferred by a bull. But now Boniface put it on a footing with other states, and made a donation of it to the emperor Albert of Austria, whom he had sometime before excommunicated, but who was now his dearly beloved son, and the supporter of the church. Observe only these words of his bull: "We give you by the plenitude of our power. . . . the kingdom of France, which of right belongs to the emperors of the West." Boniface and his secretary did not certainly give themselves time to think, that if France of right belonged to the emperor, there was no room for the exertion of this plenitude of power. There was, however, some shadow of reason in this absurdity; it flattered the pretensions of the empire in all the dominions of the West, for you will always find that the German civilians were of opinion, or at least pretended to be so, that the Roman state having delivered up itself, together with its bishop, to Charlemagne, all the West, of consequence, belonged

to his successors, and that the other states were only branches torn from the empire.

Had Albert of Austria had an army of two hundred thousand men, it is certain that he would have taken advantage of Boniface's bounty; but being poor, and not well settled on his throne, he left the pope to the ridiculousness of his donation.

The king of France was now at full liberty to treat the pope as a prince with whom he was at open war. Accordingly he joined with the family of the Colonnas, who cared as little for excommunication as himself; and who frequently checked in Rome that very power, which was so formidable in other places. William de Nogaret was sent into Italy under plausible pretences, where he privately raised a few horse, and gave rendezvous to Sciarra Colonna. Having surprized Boniface at Anagni, a town in his dominions, and the place of his birth, they cried out, "Let the pope die, and the French live." But the pontiff did not lose courage; he dressed himself in his cope, put his tiara on his head, and holding the keys in one hand and the cross in the other, he went and presented himself in a majestic manner before Colonna and Nogaret. It is by no means certain that Colonna had the brutality to strike him, as has been asserted. The writers of that time mention, that he cried out to him, "Tyrant, renounce the pontificate which thou dishonourest, as thou formerly obliged Celestin to renounce it." The pope boldly replied, "I am pope, and I will die pope;" upon which the French plundered his palace, and made themselves masters of his treasure. But after committing these outrages, which were more becoming a robber than a great king, the inhabitants of Anagni perceiving the small number of French, and being ashamed to leave their countryman and their pope in the hands of foreigners, flew to their arms, and drove away the French.

1303 As to Boniface, he went to Rome, meditating revenge, but died soon after his arrival.

In this manner were almost all the popes treated in Italy, who aimed at being too powerful; so that we see

see them constantly giving away kingdoms, and persecuted themselves at home.

Philip the Fair pursued his enemy even into the grave, by endeavouring to get his memory condemned in a council. He pressed Clement V. a native of France, and who resided in Avignon, to commence a process in form against Boniface. The accusation was, that he had engaged his predecessor Celestin V. to resign the pontifical chair; that he had supplanted him by unlawful methods, and had caused him to be murdered in prison. The last charge was but too true. One of his domestics, named Maffredo, and thirteen more, deposed, that he had more than once insulted the religion which had made him so powerful, by saying, "That the fabulous story of Christ had been of great use to him." Consequently, that he denied the mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and Transubstantiation. These depositions are still extant in the collection of judicial enquiries made on that occasion. The number of witnesses generally strengthens a charge, but here they weaken it. It is not in the least probable that a supreme pontiff would have uttered, in the presence of thirteen witnesses, what one would hardly mention to a single person.

Philip insisted that the body of the deceased pope should be taken out of the grave, and burnt by the common executioner. Clement V. however was prudent enough to find excuses for putting off, from time to time, an enquiry which would have proved extremely dishonourable to the church.

The conclusion of all this affair was, that the king, so far from persecuting the memory of Boniface VIII. contented himself with merely having the interdict taken off, which had been levelled against him and his subjects. He even suffered Negaret, who had so well served him, who had acted wholly in his name, and who avenged him upon Boniface, to be condemned by the successor of the pontiff to perpetual exile in Palestine; so that all the noble beginnings of Philip the Fair terminated only in disgrace. In this great portrait
of

of the world you will never find a king of France, who in the long run has got the better of a pope. They may compromise matters indeed, but Rome will always be a gainer by the bargain, and France out of pocket. You will find only the parliaments of the kingdom opposing with steadiness the artifices of the holy see, and very often the policy or the weakness of the cabinet; the exigence of circumstances and the intrigues of the monks, will render this steadiness of the parliaments of no effect; and this weakness will continue till a king of France is bold enough to say, "I am resolved to free myself and my subjects from these shackles."

Philip the Fair, in order to give vent to his displeasure, drove all the Jews out of his kingdom, seized upon their wealth, and forbade them ever to return again under pain of death. This arret was not issued by the parliament; it was in virtue of a secret ordinance, passed by his privy council, that Philip punished the usury of the Jews by an act of injustice, by which the people thought themselves revenged, and the king found himself enriched.

Some time afterwards all Europe and Asia were amazed at an event, which had also its source in the vindictive spirit of Philip the Fair.

C H A P. LXVI.

Of the Punishment of the Knights Templars, and of the Suppression of this Order.

AMONG the many contradictions which take place in the government of this world, we may reckon it a very great one, that there should be such an institution as that of armed monks, who make a vow of living at the same time as anchorets and soldiers.

The knights templars were accused of uniting all the odious qualities of these two professions; namely, the debauchery and cruelty of the soldier, and the insatiable

tiable passion of gain, imputed to those great orders that have made a vow of poverty.

While they, and the knights Hospitallers of St. John, tasted the fruits of their labour, the Teutonic order, which had its rise, as well as theirs, in Palestine, made themselves masters, in the thirteenth century, of Prussia, Livonia, Courland, and Samogitia. The Teutonic knights were accused of reducing the clergy as well as the peasants to a state of slavery, of stripping them of their property, of usurping the privileges of bishops, and of exercising the most horrid acts of rapine and plunder: but their great power and success hindered any enquiry after their conduct. The Templars were grown the objects of envy, because they lived among their countrymen with all the splendor and pomp attending opulence, and in such lawless pleasures as soldiers generally indulge themselves in, when unrestrained by marriage.

The severity of the taxes, together with the mal practices of Philip the Fair, in respect to the coin, raised a sedition in Paris. The Templars, to whom the ¹³⁰⁶ care of the king's treasure was intrusted, were accused of having had a share in the mutiny; and we have already seen that Philip was implacable in his hatred.

The first accusers of this order were a burgher of Beziers, named Squin de Florian, and Noffo de Florentin, an apostate knight Templar, who were both at that time in confinement for different crimes. They requested to see the king, to whom only they were willing to discover certain affairs of the utmost importance. Their request was complied with, and the king on their deposition, directed all the bailiffs and officers of the kingdom to call in a proper aid and assistance; and sent them an order sealed, with prohibition, upon pain of death, not to open it before the 13th of October. Upon the day appointed, each of them opened the ¹³⁰⁹ order which they found was to imprison the knights Templars. Accordingly they were all arrested; and the king immediately caused all the estates of those knights

to be seized upon till they could be properly disposed of.

It appears very plain, that the ruin of the Templars was resolved upon long before this step was taken. Their accusation and imprisonment was in 1309; but letters have been found from Philip the Fair to the count of Flanders, dated at Melun in 1306, in which he begs him to assist him in extirpating those knights.

It now became necessary to try this vast multitude of criminals. Pope Clement V. a creature of Philip, and who then resided at Poitiers, joined with this prince, after having settled some disputes between them concerning the right which the church had of judging religious orders, and the king's right of punishing his subjects. The pope himself examined seventy-two knights; the rest were prosecuted by inquisitors, and commissaries appointed for that purpose. Bulls were sent to all the potentates of Europe to excite them to imitate the example of France: they were complied with in Castile, Arragon, Sicily, and England; but these unfortunate people were put to death no where except in France. They were accused by two hundred and one witnesses of denying Jesus Christ at their admittance into the order, of spitting upon the cross, and of worshipping a gilded head erected on a block with four feet. The novice kissed the knight who had made his vow of religion, and was received by him with a kiss at his mouth, his navel, and in those parts which seem the least designed for this use; and then he swore to be directed entirely by his brethren. The informations preserved down to our time, tell us that this was acknowledged by seventy-two Templars to the pope himself, and by one hundred and forty-one of the accused, to brother William, a Franciscan friar, and inquisitor, in the city of Paris, before a number of witnesses. We are likewise told, that the grand-master of the order himself, the grand-master of Cyprus, and the masters of France, Poitou, Vienne, and Normandy, made the same confession to three cardinals deputed by the pope.

It

It is certain, that above one hundred knights were put to the most cruel torture; that fifty-nine were burnt alive in one day near the abbey of St. Anthony in Paris,¹⁰¹² and that the grand-master, John of Molay, and Guy, brother of the dauphin of Auvergne, two of the principal noblemen in Europe, the one by his dignity, and the other by his birth, were thrown alive into the flames, on the very spot where the equestrian statue of King Henry IV. stands at present.

The public execution of such a number of respectable citizens; the multitude of witnesses who appeared against them, and the numerous depositions even of the accused themselves, would seem to be strong proofs of their guilt, and to justify the suppression of this order.

But, on the other hand, there is a great deal to be said in their favour: and, in the first place, most of the witnesses who deposed against the Templars, only bring a vague and general charge. Secondly, very few pretend to say, that they denied Jesus Christ. For, after all, what could they get by reviling a religion from which they derived their subsistence, and in defence of which they drew their swords. Thirdly, though several of them who had been witnesses, and accomplices of the debauchery of princes and ecclesiastics of those days, might have expressed some contempt for the abuses of a religion so greatly dishonoured in Asia and in Europe; though they might have expressed their minds when they were off their guard, in the manner Boniface VIII. is said to have done; yet this would have amounted to no more than an indiscretion of young people, for which the whole order surely was not accountable. Fourthly, that gilded head, which it was pretended they worshipped, and which was preserved at Marseilles, ought to have been produced at their trial: but there was not so much as the least pains taken to find it; and we must acknowledge, that such an accusation confutes itself. Fifthly, the indecent manner in which they are said to have been admitted into the order, could never have been established among them as a law. A person must have a very inadequate notion of mankind, who ima-

gines that there are communities which support themselves by immorality, and which establish incontinency as a duty. It is the aim of every society to render itself respectable to those who want to enter into it. I make no doubt, but that several young Templars gave themselves up to excesses, which youth in all ages have been guilty of; and it is surely better to overlook than to punish such transitory vices. Sixthly, although so great a number of witnesses deposed against the Templars, yet there were a great many strangers, who gave their testimony in favour of the order. Seventhly, if the accused were so overpowered by the torture (which extorts falsehood as well as the truth from the mouths of the tortured) as to confess such a multitude of crimes; this confession is perhaps no less to the dishonour of the judges than of the knights: they had been promised a pardon to induce them to confess. Eighthly, the fifty-nine that were burnt alive, called God to witness their innocence, and would not accept of life on the terms offered them; namely, that they should acknowledge themselves guilty. Ninthly, seventy-four Templars, who were not accused, undertook to defend their order, but were refused a hearing. Tenthly, when the confession of the grand-master, which had been drawn up before three cardinals, was read to that old warrior who could neither read nor write, he cried out aloud, that they had imposed upon him; that the deposition in writing was different from that which he had delivered by word of mouth; that the cardinals, who were the authors of such treacherous villainy, deserved to be punished in the same manner as the Turks punish forgers, by splitting them in two. Eleventhly, the grand-master, and Guy, brother of the dauphin of Auvergne, might have saved their lives if they would have publicly acknowledged their guilt: they were burnt only because when solicited upon the scaffold, and in the presence of the people, to acknowledge the crimes of their order, they made oath that the order was innocent. This declaration provoked the king, and was the cause of their being executed. They died

died invoking the divine vengeance in vain against their persecutors.

In consequence of the pope's bull, and of their great estates, prosecutions were carried on against the Templars in all parts of Europe: but in Germany they took care that no body should seize on their persons. In their castles in Arragon they held out sieges. At length the pope abolished the order by his sole authority, in a private consistory, during the council of Vienne. Every body strove to share the spoils: the kings of Castile and Arragon seized on part of their estates, and part they gave to the knights of Calatrava. In France, Italy, England, and Germany their lands were given to the Hospitallers, at that time called the Knights of Rhodes, because they had lately taken that island from the Turks, and by their courage and conduct in defending it, deserved at least the spoils of the Templars for their reward.

Denis, king of Portugal, founded in their stead the Knights of Christ, an order instituted to fight against the Moors, but which afterwards became an empty honour; and of late has ceased even to be an honour by being too common.

Philip the Fair seized on the estates of the Templars to the value of two hundred thousand livres, and Louis Hutin his son took to the amount of sixty thousand.

I do not know what share accrued to the pope; but it is evident that the expences of the cardinals and inquisitors delegated to carry on this horrid process, amounted to immense sums. I was perhaps mistaken when I read the circular letter of Philip the Fair, in which he commands his subjects to restore the moveables and other effects of the Templars to the pope's commissioners. This ordinance of Philip is related by Peter Dupui. We thought that the pope had profited by this pretended restitution; for to whom can a restitution be made, but to those who are considered as the proprietors? In those days the popes were thought to be the masters of all church possessions; however I have
not

not been able to discover what share the pope had in this plunder, but we are told that he did not forget himself in the partition.

We must now take a view of another transaction that happened at the same time, which does more honour to human nature, and which laid the foundation of an invincible republic.

C H A P. LXVII.

Of Switzerland, and the Revolution of that Country in the Beginning of the Fourteenth Century.

SWITZERLAND, of all the countries in Europe, was that which had deviated the least from the simplicity and poverty of the primitive ages. If it had not asserted its liberty, it would have no place in the history of the world; but would be confounded with so many other provinces of greater fertility and riches, which follow the fate of those kingdoms to which they are annexed. Objects that have not something in themselves considerable, seldom attract our attention. A gloomy climate, a rocky and barren soil, mountains and precipices, these were all the gifts that nature had bestowed on more than three-fourths of this country. And yet the sovereignty of these rocks was disputed with as much fury, as when such multitudes of men were sacrificed for the kingdom of Naples, or for Asia Minor.

During those eighteen years of anarchy, in which Germany was without an emperor, there was a hard struggle between the lords of castles and several prelates, about who should have a small portion of Switzerland. The small towns of this country wanted to be free, as the cities of Italy, under the protection of the empire.

When Rodolphus was elected emperor, certain lords of castles juridically accused the cantons of Schweitz, Uri,

Uri, and Underwald, of having withdrawn themselves from their feudal subjection. Rodolphus, who had formerly fought against those petty tyrants, determined in favour of the citizens.

Albert of Austria, his son, having succeeded to the imperial dignity, wanted to erect Switzerland into a principality for one of his children. Part of this country was his own demesne, as Lucern, Zurich, and Glaris; and tyrannical governors were sent among them, who abused their power.

The founders of the Helvetian liberty were Melchtal, Stauffacher, and Walther Furst of Uri. The difficulty of pronouncing these respectable names has been an hindrance to their fame. These three peasants were the first conspirators; each of them brought three more into the plot; and these nine men prevailed on the three cantons of Schweiz, Uri, and Underwald to join them.

All the historians assert, that while this conspiracy was ripening, a governor of Uri, whose name was Grifler, devised a very ridiculous, and at the same time detestable act of tyranny; he caused, they say, his cap to be put upon a pole in the public market-place, with an injunction, upon pain of death, to every one that passed by, to pay respect to it. One of the conspirators, named William Tell, refused to pay this compliment: the governor condemned him to be hanged, but granted him his pardon on condition that the criminal, who was an excellent marksman, should shoot an arrow at an apple placed upon the head of his own son. The father trembling let fly his arrow, and had the luck to hit the apple. Grifler perceiving a second arrow under Tell's coat, asked him what he intended to do with it; *It was designed for thee*, said the Swiss in a rage, *if I had wounded my son*. We must allow that this story of the apple is very suspicious. It seems as if they thought it their duty to deck the cradle of the Helvetic republic with fabulous embellishments. This however is certain, that Tell having been laid in irons, killed the governor afterwards with
an

an arrow; that this was the signal for the conspirators; and that the people immediately rose up in arms, and demolished the fortresses.

The emperor Albert of Austria, who would fain have punished these free people, was prevented by death. Leopold duke of Austria marched against them with an army of twenty thousand men: the people of Switzerland behaved on this occasion, just as the Lacedæmonians formerly had done at the Streights of Thermopylæ. A small body of four or five hundred men waited for the Austrian army at the pass of Morgate: but they were more fortunate than the Lacedæmonians; for they put the enemy to flight, only by rolling great stones down upon them. The other detachments of Leopold's army were beaten at the same time by as small a number of Swiss.

As this victory was obtained in the canton of Schwitz, the other two cantons gave this name to their confederacy, which becoming more general, reminds them, by the very name, of the victory to which they were indebted for their liberty.

By degrees the other cantons joined in the confederacy. That of Berne, which now has the same weight in Switzerland, as Amsterdam has in Holland, did not enter into the alliance till 1352; and it was not till the year 1513 that the little country of Appenzel joined the other cantons, and completed the number of thirteen.

Never did any people fight longer or more bravely for their liberty than the Swiss: they gained it by sixty pitched battles with the Austrians; and in all probability they will preserve it many ages. Every country that is not of a great extent, that does not abound in wealth, and is governed by mild laws, ought to be free. The new government in Switzerland has changed even the face of nature. The stony soil, which had lain fallow under their oppressive masters, has been at length manured. The vine is now planted on their rocks. The heaths which have been plowed since they have recovered their freedom, are become fruitful lands.

Equality,

Equality, the natural inheritance of mankind, still subsists as much as possible in Switzerland. You are not, by this term, to understand that absurd and impossible equality, by which the master and the servant, the magistrate and the artificer, the plaintiff and the judge are confounded together; but that equality by which the subject depends only on the laws; and which is the defence of the weak, against the ambition of the powerful. This country, in short, would have deserved to have been called happy, if religion had not divided those citizens, whom the love of the public good had before united; and if while they sold their valour to princes more rich than themselves, they had always preserved that incorrupt integrity for which they are distinguished.

In every nation there have been times, wherein the minds of the people have been transported beyond their usual bounds. These times have been less frequent in Switzerland than in other countries. Simplicity, frugality, modesty, those preservers of liberty, have been ever their constant characteristic. They have maintained no armies to defend their frontiers, or to invade their neighbours; they have built no citadels to defy their enemies, or to enslave their fellow-citizens: they have laid no taxes on the public. They are neither obliged to support the luxury nor the troops of a master. Their mountains are their bulwark; and every citizen is a soldier in the defence of his country. There are very few republican states in the world, and these are indebted for their liberty to the rocks or the sea that serve them as bulwarks. Mankind in general are very seldom worthy to have the government of themselves.

C H A P. LXVIII.

The State of the Empire, Italy, and the Papacy, in the fourteenth Century, continued.

WE have already entered upon the fourteenth century; and here we may observe, that during

the last six hundred years, Rome, though weak and unfortunate, was constantly the most important object in Europe. It exerted its influence by means of religion, at the very time it was fallen into anarchy and contempt; and notwithstanding its abject condition, and the disorders with which it was afflicted, neither the emperors could establish the throne of the Cæsars, nor the pontiffs make themselves absolute in that capital. Since the reign of Frederick II. there had been four successive emperors, who had entirely forgotten Italy; these were Conrad IV. Rodolphus I. Adolphus of Nassau, and Albert of Austria. Then it was that the several cities in Italy recovered their natural rights, and set up the standard of liberty. Genoa and Pisa began to rival Venice; and Florence rose to be a famous republic. Bologna, at that time, was subject neither to the emperor, nor to the pope. The municipal form of government prevailed in every city; but especially at Rome. Clement V. who was called the Gascon Pope, chose rather to remove the holy see out of Italy, and to enjoy in France the benefit of the contributions that were paid by all the faithful, than to dispute to no purpose about towns and villages in the neighbourhood of Rome. The court of Rome was therefore removed to the frontiers of France; and this is what the Romans to this very day call the captivity of Babylon. Clement went from Lyons to Vienne in Dauphiny, and from thence to Avignon, carrying with him the countess of Perigord, and drawing all the money he possibly could from the piety of the faithful. This is the same pope whom we have already seen suppressing the order of the Templars.

How happened it that the Italians, at this juncture, when neither the emperor nor the pope any longer resided in their country, did not follow the example of the Germans, who, notwithstanding the presence of the emperors, have, from age to age, established a limitation of the supreme power, and their own independence? As there were neither popes nor emperors in

in Italy, who then was it that forged new chains for this delightful country?—Their intestine divisions. The factions of the Guelfs and Gibelines, which originated from the disputes between the priesthood and the empire, still continued, like a fire that is fed by constant fuel. Discord prevailed on every side. Italy was not united into one body like Germany. In short, the first enterprizing emperor who had thought fit to repass the Alps, might have revived the rights and pretensions of the Charlemagnes and the Orhos. This was the case at length of Henry VII. of the house of Luxembourg, in 1311. He marched into Italy with a German army, which proclaimed his authority. The Guelfs considered this as a new irruption of Barbarians; but the Gibelines favoured his undertakings. He subdued all the towns of Lombardy, and after thus making a new conquest of that country, at length marched to Rome to receive the imperial crown.

Rome, who wanted neither emperor nor pope, but who could never shake off the yoke of either, in vain endeavoured to shut her gates against the conqueror. Neither the Ursis, nor the brother of Robert king of Naples, were able to prevent the emperor from entering with sword in hand, assisted by the Colonnas. They fought a long time in the streets, and a bishop of Liege was slain by the emperor's side. There was a great deal of bloodshed for this ceremony of the coronation, which was afterwards performed by three cardinals instead of the pope. We must not omit observing, that Henry protested before a notary, that the oath he took at his consecration, was not an oath of allegiance. This proves that the popes of those days pretended that the emperor was their vassal.

The emperor having thus made himself master of Rome, appointed a governor of that city; and he also ordained, that all the cities and princes of Italy should pay an annual tribute to him. In this order he included even the kingdom of Naples, at that time a

distinct government from Sicily; and he summoned the king of Naples to appear before him. Thus did Henry revive his pretensions to Naples. The pope was lord paramount of that kingdom; and the emperor stiled himself lord paramount of the pope.

Henry VII. was going to make good his pretensions to the kingdom of Naples by force of arms, when he died, as it is pretended, by poison, which a Dominican friar is said to have mixed with the consecrated wine.

1313 The emperors at that time received the holy communion in both kinds, as canons of St. John de Lateran. They were allowed to perform the office of deacons when the pope said mass; and the kings of France had a right to officiate as subdeacons.

There are no juridical proofs that Henry VII. died by this sacrilegious poisoning. Father Bernard Politanus, of Montepulciano, was accused of it: but thirty years after, the Dominicans obtained letters-patent from John king of Bohemia, son of Henry VII. by which they were declared innocent. It was a melancholy circumstance to stand in need of such letters.

There was very little order at that time in the elections of the popes, and those of the emperors were equally irregular. Mankind had not as yet learnt to prevent schisms on such occasions, by the establishment of wise laws.

Louis of Bavaria, and Frederic the Handsome, duke of Austria, were elected at the same time in the heat of violence and faction. Nothing but the fate of war could determine a point, which should have been previously adjusted by a regular diet of electors. At length a battle, in which the Austrian was conquered and taken prisoner, gave the crown to the Bavarian.

John XXII. who had been elected at Lyons in 1316, was at that time the reigning pope. Lyons looked upon itself then as a free city, but the bishop wanted to be master of it, and the kings of France had not as yet been able to bring the bishop into subjection.

Philip

Philip the Long was no sooner crowned king of France than he assembled the cardinals in this free city; and after having sworn that he would use no violence towards them, he shut them all up, nor did he release them till they had nominated John XXII.

This pope affords us another striking example of the regard paid to merit in the church. And surely he must have possessed it in a great degree, to have been able to rise from the profession of a cobbler to the dignity of having his feet kissed.

We may rank him among those pontiffs whose greatness of mind has been equal to the obscurity of their birth. We have already observed that the pontifical court subsisted intirely by the contributions of the Christian world. This was a more valuable fund than the lands of the countess Matilda. When I mention the merit of John XXII. I do not mean his disinterestedness. He was even more eager than any of his predecessors, in exacting not only the St. Peter's pence, which were paid very irregularly by England, but likewise the contributions of Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Poland. He used to solicit so often, and with so much earnestness, that he always got something. But that which was the most profitable to him was an apostolic tax upon sins. He set a price upon murder, adultery, sodomy, and bestiality; and men who were so wicked as to commit these crimes, were likewise foolish enough to pay for them. But to reside at Lyons, and to have little or no authority in Italy, was as if he had not been pope.

While he remained in France, and Louis of Bavaria was strengthening himself in Germany, both the emperor and he were losing ground in Italy. The Viscontis had begun to establish themselves in Milan: the emperor Louis finding himself unable to crush them, pretended to grant them his protection, and to make them his lieutenants. They were Gibelines, and as such they seized on part of those lands of the countess Matilda, which had been a perpetual subject of discord. John made the inquisition declare them heretics. As he

he resided in France, he could run no risk in publishing one of those bulls which give and take away empires. Accordingly he deposed Louis of Bavaria in his own imagination, depriving him, as the terms of the bull express it, "Of all his goods moveable and im-
"moveable."

1327 The emperor, thus deposed, marched with all expedition into Italy, where he who had deposed him did not dare to appear. He arrived at Rome, the transient residence of the emperors, in company with Castracani*, the tyrant of Lucca, and the hero of Machiavel.

1328 Ludovico Monaldesco, a native of Orvieto, who wrote the memoirs of his own time at the age of an hundred and fifteen, says that he well remembers this public entry of the emperor Louis of Bavaria. The people cried out, "Praise be to God and to the emperor; we are at length delivered from war, famine, and the pope." This passage deserves to be quoted, only as it is from an author who wrote at the age of an hundred and fifteen.

Louis of Bavaria convoked a general assembly at Rome, which resembled the ancient parliaments of Charlemagne and his sons. This meeting was held in St. Peter's square. German and Italian princes, with the deputies of towns, bishops, abbots, and monks, assisted there in great number. The emperor seated on a throne, above the steps that led to the church, with the crown on his head, and a golden sceptre in his hand, ordered an Augustine friar to cry out three times, "Is there any one willing to defend the cause of

* This celebrated Italian general was born at Lucca in 1284, and exposed when an infant in a vineyard, where he was found by a person of the illustrious family of Castracani, who gave him that name, and brought him up as carefully as if he had been his own son. Castracani took up arms early in life in favour of the Gibelines, and at length, by his superior courage and abilities, rose to be sovereign of Lucca. He died at the age of forty-four. Machiavel has written the life of this extraordinary man. T.

"the priest of Cahors, who styles himself pope John?" 1328
 No body appearing, Louis pronounced sentence, by which he deprived the pope of all ecclesiastical benefices, and delivered him up to the secular power to be burnt as an heretic. Thus to condemn a supreme pontiff to death, was the highest extravagance that the quarrel between the priesthood and the empire could possibly produce.

Some days after, the emperor with the same ceremony created a new pope, who was a Franciscan friar, and by birth a Neapolitan: he invested him with the ring, put the cope round his shoulders, and made him sit down by his side under the canopy; but he took care not to conform to the custom of kissing the pope's feet.

Among all the religious orders, the Franciscans at that time made the greatest noise. Some of them had pretended that perfection consisted in wearing a capuche or cowl sharp pointed, and a very close habit. To this reform of dress they added another degree of perfection, namely, that they had no manner of property either in their meat or drink. The pope had condemned these propositions; a step which greatly shocked the reformers. At length the quarrel growing serious, 1318 the inquisitors of Marseilles had caused four of those wretched friars to be burnt.

The Franciscan, who had been nominated pope by the emperor, was of their party; this was reason enough that John should be an heretic. It was this pope's fate to be suspected of heresy: for some time after, happening to preach that the blessed would not enjoy the beatific vision till the last judgment, and that in the mean time they had an imperfect vision; these two visions divided the whole church, and John at last thought proper to retract.

All this parade, however, of Louis of Bavaria at Rome, was attended with no other consequence than the efforts of so many other German Cæsars. The troubles of Germany called them home, and they missed their aim in Italy.

Louis

Louis of Bavaria was far from being a powerful prince: hence it is no wonder that after his return to Germany, he could not hinder his pope from being taken prisoner by John XXII's partisans, and carried to Avignon, where he was confined. In a word, such was the difference at that time between an emperor and a pope, that Louis of Bavaria, though a prudent prince, died very poor in his own country; while the pope, who lived at a distance from Rome, and drew very little from Italy, left when he died at Avignon, if we may believe Villani, a cotemporary writer, to the
1344 amount of five and twenty millions of florins of gold. Villani certainly exaggerates: even if this sum was reduced one-third, still it would be a great deal. Indeed the papacy was never worth so much to any other person; but never did any other pope set up such a multitude of benefices to sale, nor at so high a price.

He had the reservation of all the prebends, of almost all the bishoprics, and the revenue of all vacant benefices. By the art of reserving he had found out the method of anticipating almost every election, and of conferring every benefice. Besides, he never nominated a bishop, but he removed seven or eight. Each promotion brought on another, and they were all productive of money. The taxes for dispensations and sins were invented and digested in his time. The code of these taxes has been printed several times since the sixteenth century, with an intent of exposing most shocking abuses, which the church indeed has ever condemned, and with some difficulty abolished.

The popes, his successors, continued at Avignon till the year 1331. This city did not belong to them, but to the counts of Provence; the popes however found means insensibly to make themselves the usufructuary masters of it, while the counts of Provence were disputing about the kingdom of Naples.

The unfortunate queen Joan, whose history we are about to relate, thought herself very fortunate in 1348, in ceding Avignon to pope Clement VI. for eighty
thousand

thousand florins of gold, which he never paid. Here the popes kept their court in quiet, diffusing plenty through Provence and Dauphiny, and forgetting their tempestuous residence at Rome.

The Romans, ever since the reign of Charlemagne, had constantly preserved their ancient ideas of grandeur and liberty. We have observed that at one time they chose several senators, at another but one, or else a patrician, a governor, or a consul, and sometimes a tribune. When they found that the pope had made a purchase of Avignon, they thought once more of restoring their republic. With this view they conferred the tribuneship on a private citizen, whose name was Nicholas Rienzi, vulgarly called *Cola*, a man of a fanatic and ambitious disposition, and consequently capable of great enterprizes. He took the reins of government into his hands, and the Romans had high expectations from their new magistrate. It is of him that Petrarch speaks in the most beautiful of all his odes or canzoni, where he describes Rome, with disheveled hair, her eyes bedewed with tears, and imploring the assistance of Rienzi.

Con gli occhi di dolor bagnati e molli

Ti chier' mercè di tutti sette i colli.

This tribune assumed the title of, "The severe and clement deliverer of Rome, the zealous defender of Italy, and the lover of mankind in general." He declared that the people of Italy were all free, and citizens of Rome. But these convulsions of a long expiring liberty had no more effect than the pretensions of the emperors to Rome. This tribuneship was as short-lived as the senate and consulate, which had been restored to no purpose. Rienzi having begun like the Gracchi, made the like end: he was assassinated by a faction of the patrician families.

Rome was in danger of being ruined by the absence of the papal court, by the troubles of Italy, the barrenness of its territory, and by the removal of its manufactures to Genoa, Pisa, Venice, and Florence. The

resort of pilgrims was at that time its only support. The grand jubilee, which Boniface VIII. appointed to be held at the beginning of every century, and which was afterwards shortened by Clement VI. to every fiftieth year, used to attract such swarms, that in 1350, they reckoned two hundred thousand pilgrims in that capital. Thus Rome, without either emperor or pope, was in a feeble state, and yet the metropolis of the Christian world.

C H A P. LXIX.

Of Joan, Queen of Naples.

WE have already observed, that the holy see had purchased Avignon of Joan of Anjou and Provence. Princes rarely dispose of their dominions when their affairs are prosperous. The misfortunes and the death of this queen are connected with all the transactions of that time, but especially with the great schism of the West, which we shall presently have under our consideration.

Naples and Sicily were still governed by foreigners; Naples by the house of France, and Sicily by that of Arragon. Robert, who died in 1343, had rendered Naples a flourishing kingdom. His nephew Louis of Anjou was elected king of Hungary. Thus the house of France extended its branches on all sides: but those branches being neither united with the stock, nor among themselves, were all of them unfortunate. Robert king of Naples, before he died, had married Joan his grand-daughter and heir, to Andrew brother of the king of Hungary. This marriage, which was expected to cement the happiness of the family, proved the source of its misfortunes. Andrew pretended to govern of his own authority. Joan, young as she was, would not consent to his being more than the queen's comfort. A Franciscan monk, named brother Robert, who governed Andrew, blew the coals of hatred and discord between

between the husband and wife. The queen had a court of Neapolitans, Andrew another of Hungarians, who were looked upon as barbarians by the natives of the country: these circumstances tended to strengthen their mutual antipathy. Louis, prince of Tarentum, and of the blood royal, who afterwards married the queen, entered into a conspiracy with other princes of the blood, with the favourites of that princess, and with her servant the celebrated Catanese, who was strongly attached to her mistress, to murder Andrew. They strangled him in the city of Aversa in his wife's anti-chamber, almost in her presence, and flung him out of the window. His body lay three days unburied. A year after the queen married the prince of Tarentum, whom the public voice accused of the murder. What strong reasons to believe her guilty! They who attempt to justify her, alledge that she had four husbands, and that a queen who submitted so readily to the yoke of matrimony ought not to be accused of crimes which are the offspring only of lawless love. But is love the only cause of such crimes? Joan consented to the murder of her husband through weakness; and she was afterwards thrice married, in consequence of another weakness, still more excusable, the incapacity of reigning alone.

Louis of Hungary wrote to Joan, that he would revenge the death of his brother Andrew upon her and her accomplices. Accordingly he marched towards Naples, by the way of Venice and Rome, and at the last of those cities publicly impeached Joan before the tribune Cola Rienzi, who during his short and ridiculous administration beheld kings at his tribunal, like the ancient Romans. Rienzi was afraid to pass sentence, and in this alone he shewed his prudence.

In the mean while Louis advanced towards Naples, with a black standard, on which was represented the murder of the king. He struck off the head of Charles¹³⁴⁷ of Durazzo, a prince of the blood, who had been accessory to the murder. He pursued queen Joan, who fled with her second husband to her territories in

Provence. But what is very extraordinary, ambition had no share in these proceedings of Louis. He might have made himself master of the kingdom, but he did not attempt it. Such examples of moderation are very rare. He is said to have been a prince of the most strict virtue, on which account he was afterwards elected king of Poland. We shall speak of him more particularly when we come to treat of the state of Hungary.

Joan thus punished before she was twenty years old, for a crime which involved her people in as great calamities as herself, and abandoned at the same time both by the Neapolitans and the Provencals, repaired to pope Clement VI. in Avignon, of which place she was
1348 sovereign: she resigned both the town and territory to him for eighty thousand florins, which were never paid. While this contract was negotiating, she pleaded her cause in person before the consistory, who declared her innocent. Clement VI. in order to prevail on the king of Hungary to retire from Naples, stipulated that Joan should pay him three hundred thousand florins. Louis replied, "That he was not come to sell his brother's blood, but that as he had partly taken his revenge, he was satisfied, and would return to his country." The spirit of chivalry, which prevailed in those days, never produced a stronger instance of rigour, and generosity.

The queen having been expelled from her kingdom by her brother-in-law, and restored by the pope, lost her second husband, and for some years enjoyed the government alone. She married afterwards a prince
1376 of Arragon, who died in a very short time. At length, at the age of six and forty, she was married again to a younger brother of the house of Brunswick, named Otho. This was rather chusing a husband to please her fancy, than a prince to defend her dominions. The next heir to the crown was another Charles of Durazzo her cousin, the only issue remaining at Naples of the first house of Anjou. These princes bore that name, because the town of Durazzo, which they had conquered from

from the Greeks, and which was afterwards wrested from them by the Venetians, had once been their appanage. She acknowledged this Durazzo as her next heir, and even adopted him as her son. This adoption, and the great schism of the West, hastened the death of that unfortunate princess.

The unhappy consequences of this schism, of which we shall presently give a particular account, had already begun to appear. Brigano, who took the name of Urban VI. and the count of Geneva, who stiled himself Clement VII. disputed the pontifical tiara with the utmost fury. All Europe was divided in the quarrel. Joan sided with Clement, who resided at Avignon. Durazzo, impatient to reign, and unwilling to wait for the natural death of his adoptive mother, took the part of Urban.

The pope crowned Durazzo in Rome, on condition ¹³⁸⁰ that his nephew Brigano should have the principality of Capua. He excommunicated and deposed queen Joan; and, in order to secure the principality of Capua in his family, he gave away all the church lands to the principal families of Naples.

Urban accompanied Durazzo in his march to Naples. The church plate was employed in raising an army. The queen could receive no succours from Clement, whom she had recognized as pope, nor from her new husband. She had but few troops. In this situation she called to her assistance a brother of Charles V. king of France, who bore also the name of Anjou, and adopted him instead of the ungrateful Durazzo.

Louis of Anjou, the new heir to Joan, arrived too late to defend his benefactress, or to maintain his right to a kingdom which had been settled upon him.

The choice which the queen made of this prince, alienated still more the minds of her subjects, who were afraid of more foreigners. The pope and Charles of Durazzo were advancing: when Otho of Brunswick assembled a few troops in a hurry; but was defeated and made prisoner.

Soon

Soon after this Durazzo entered Naples; the queen had sent for six galleys from her county of Provence, which were at anchor under the Egg Castle, but could be of no use to her. It was all too late: there was no possibility of escaping; so she fell into the hands of the usurper. This prince to colour his barbarity, declared himself the avenger of Andrew's death. He consulted Louis of Hungary, who still inexorable, made answer, "That the queen ought to suffer the same death as her first husband:" upon which Durazzo ordered her to be smothered between two mattresses. Thus in every country we find one crime punished by another. What misfortunes in the family of St. Louis!

Posterity, which is ever impartial, when it comes at the truth, laments the fate of this queen, because the murder of her first husband was rather the effect of weakness than of an evil disposition, for she was only eighteen years old, when she gave her consent to that horrid deed: and after that time she could never be charged with debauchery, cruelty or injustice. But it is the people we ought to pity: they were the sufferers during those disturbances. Louis duke of Anjou, carried off the treasures of his brother king Charles V. and impoverished France, in attempting to revenge the death of queen Joan, and to recover his inheritance. He died not long after in Apulia without success and without glory, without friends and without money.

The kingdom of Naples, which had begun to emerge from Barbarism under king Robert, was now plunged into it again by all these calamities, which were further heightened by the grand schism. Before we take a view of this grand dispute in the church, which was settled at length by the emperor Sigismund, let us see what form the empire had assumed at that time.

C H A P. LXX.

Of the Emperor Charles IV.—Of the Golden Bull.—Of the Return of the Holy See from Avignon to Rome.—Of Saint Catherine of Sienna.

THE German empire (for in the troubles which distinguished the latter part of the reign of Louis of Bavaria, it was no longer the Roman empire) assumed a more settled form of government under Charles IV. of Luxembourg, king of Bohemia and grandson of Henry VII. He published at Nuremberg¹³⁵⁶ that famous constitution, called the golden bull, because of the golden seal, which had the name of *bullæ* in the ages of base latinity. The stile of this charter partakes greatly of the spirit of the times. The civilian Bartolus, one of those compilers of opinions which are still considered as laws, drew up this bull. It begins with an apostrophe to pride, satan, anger, and lust. It says, that the number of the seven electors is necessary to oppose the seven deadly sins. It takes notice of the fall of angels, of the terrestrial paradise, of Pompey and Cæsar. It affirms, that Germany is founded on the three theological virtues, as also on the trinity.

This law of the empire was made in the presence and with the consent of all the princes, bishops, abbots, and even deputies of the imperial cities, who for the first time assisted at this assembly of the Teutonic nation. These privileges of cities, the natural effect of liberty, were beginning to revive in Italy, England, France and Germany. The number of electors, as is well known, was then fixed to seven. The archbishops of Mentz, Cologne and Triers, who had been long in possession of the right of electing the emperor, would not suffer any other bishops, though equal in power to themselves, to come in for a share of this honour. But how happened it that the dutchy of Bavaria was not ranked among the electorates? And why should Bohemia, originally

a distinct state from Germany, and which by the golden bull has no concern in the deliberations of the empire have yet a right of suffrage in the election? The reason is obvious: Charles IV. was king of Bohemia; and Louis of Bavaria had been his enemy.

It was said in this bull that the seven electors were already established; therefore they must have been so: but it was to have been only a short time before, for all the preceding testimonies of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries shew us, that till the reign of Frederick II. the emperor was elected by the lords and prelates possessed of fiefs; and this verse of Hoved manifestly proves it:

*Eligit unanimis cleri procerumque voluntas.**

But as the principal lords of the household were powerful princes; and as these officers had the declaring of the person who was elected by the plurality of suffrages; and lastly, as they were seven in number, they on the death of Frederick II. assumed a right of nominating him who was to be their master; and this was the real origin of the seven electors.

Originally the master of the household, the master of the horse, and the cup bearer were the principal servants to the emperor, but in process of time these officers assumed the titles of masters of the household, and cup bearers of the Roman empire. Thus in France the person who had the furnishing the king's household with wine, was called the grand butler of France; his master of the pantry and his cup bearer, became grand pantlers and grand cup bearers of France, though assuredly these officers neither served the empire, nor the kingdom of France, with bread, wine or meat. Europe was over-run with these hereditary dignities. Every province had its marshals, its great huntsmen and its chamberlains. Even the title of grand master of the beggars in Champagne, was hereditary in a certain family.

* The election depends on the unanimous consent of the lords and clergy.

The imperial dignity, which of itself conferred no real power at that time, never appeared with greater splendor however, than at this promulgation of the golden bull. The three ecclesiastic electors, all three archchancellors, were present with the seals of the empire. Mentz carried those of Germany, Cologne those of Italy, and Triers those of Gaul: yet the German empire had nothing more in Gaul than the empty homage of the remainder of the kingdom of Arles, of Provence, and Dauphiny, which were soon afterwards swallowed up in the vast kingdom of France. Savoy, which belonged to the house of Morienne, was held of the empire; and Franche Comté under the imperial protection was independent.

The title given to the emperor in the golden bull, was that of *caput orbis*, or head of the world. The dauphin of France, son to the unfortunate king John, assisted at this ceremony, and the cardinal d'Alba took the upper hand of him; so true is it, that at that time Europe was considered as a body which had two heads, and these two heads were the emperor and the pope; the other princes were regarded both in the diets and the conclaves, only as members that ought to be vassals. But remark how these customs have changed; the electors, who then yielded the precedence to the cardinals, have since acquired more dignity; and the chancellors have for a long time taken the upper hand of those who dared to sit above the dauphin. Judge after this, if any thing can be called fixed in the empire.

We have already seen what were the possessions of the emperor in Italy. In Germany his sovereignty was confined to his hereditary dominions. And yet he speaks in his bull like a despotic king; he does every thing there "of his certain knowledge and by the fullness of his power:" expressions inconsistent with the Germanic liberty, and which are no longer suffered in the imperial diets, where the emperor uses these words; "We have agreed with the states, and the states with us."

In order to give some idea of the pomp which accompanied the ceremony of the golden bull, it will be sufficient to mention that the duke of Luxembourg and Brabant, the emperor's nephew, waited upon him at table; that the duke of Saxony, as great marshal, stood with a silver measure, filled with oats; that the elector of Brandenburg gave the emperor and empress water to wash their hands; and that the count Palatine laid the golden plates on the table in the presence of all the grandees of the empire.

One would have taken Charles IV. for the king of kings. Never did Constantine, the proudest of all the emperors, make so great a display of pomp. And yet Charles IV. even while he affected to be Roman
 1346 emperor, had made an oath to pope Clement VI. before his election, that if ever he went to be crowned at Rome, he would not so much as lye one night in the city, and that he would never set foot again in Italy without leave of the holy father. And there is still extant a letter of his to cardinal Colombier, dean of the sacred college, dated in the year 1355, wherein he calls this dean, *your majesty*.

He likewise suffered the family of Visconti to continue in their usurpation of Milan and Lombardy, and the Venetians to keep possession of Padua, heretofore the sovereign of Venice, but now, like Vicenza and Verona, become her subject. He was crowned king of Arles in the city of that name, but it was on condition that he should not reside there any longer than at Rome. These various changes in customs and privileges, and this obstinacy in preserving a title, with so little power to support it, form the history of the lower empire, which the popes erected by calling Charlemagne, and afterwards the Otho's, into Italy, when in a weak state. All the popes destroyed it as much as they were able; and this body which was, and still is, called the Roman empire, was never in any manner either holy, or Roman, or even an empire.

The

The electors, whose rights had been established by the golden bull of Charles IV. soon put them in force against his own son, the emperor Wenceslaus, king of Bohemia.

France and Germany were afflicted both at the same time with a very extraordinary scourge: the emperor and the French king lost the use of their reason. On the one hand, Charles VI. by the derangement of his organs, threw France into disorder; and on the other, Wenceslaus was so stupified by gluttony, that he left the empire in a state of anarchy. Charles VI. continued on the throne, while his relations were ruining France under his name; but the barons of Bohemia¹³⁹³ confined Wenceslaus, who made his escape quite naked out of prison, and the German electors by a public sentence juridically deposed him. The sentence mentions only that he is deposed, "As being negligent, useless, profuse, and unworthy to reign."¹⁴⁰⁰

We are told, that when he received notice of his deposition, he wrote to the imperial cities, that he required no other marks of their fidelity, than that they would send him some tons of their best wine.

The melancholy situation of Germany seemed to leave an open field for the popes in Italy; but the republics and principalities erected in that country were now settled. From the time of Clement V. none of the popes had resided at Rome; but at length Gregory XI. a native of Limosin, removed his residence from Avignon to that city, though he did not understand one word of Italian.

This pontiff had had high disputes with the republic¹³⁷⁶ of Florence, which at that time was establishing its power in Italy, and had entered into an alliance with Bologna. The pope, who by the ancient donation of Matilda, pretended to be the immediate lord of this last city, was not satisfied with revenging himself by ecclesiastical censures; but even exhausted his treasures to pay the Condottieri, who at that time used to let out troops for hire. The Florentines were now desirous to make up matters, and to engage the pontiff in their interests.

interests. They imagined it would be of use to them if the pope would reside at Rome, and were therefore desirous to persuade Gregory to quit Avignon. It is difficult to conceive how at a time when they were so knowing in matters of interest, they could make use of such ridiculous means to attain their ends. The person deputed to wait upon the pope was St. Catherine of Sienna, a woman who was not only celebrated for revelations, but who pretended to have been solemnly espoused to Jesus Christ, and to have received a ring and diamond of him at her nuptials. Her confessor, Peter of Capua, who wrote her life, had been an eye-witness to most of her miracles: "I one day," says he, "saw her transformed into a man, with a little beard to her chin; and this figure, into which she was changed all of a sudden, was that of Jesus Christ himself." Such was the ambassador appointed by the Florentines. On the other hand they had recourse to the revelations of St. Bridget, who was born in Sweden, but resided at Rome, and to whom an angel dictated several letters for his holiness. These two saints, who differed on every other point, agreed in their endeavours to bring the popes back to Rome. Bridget was the saint of the Franciscans, and the Virgin Mary had revealed to her that she was born immaculate; on the other hand Catherine was the saint of the Dominicans, and the Virgin had revealed to her that she was born in sin. The popes have not all of them been men of genius. Was it simplicity in Gregory? Was he worked upon by springs proportioned to his intellects? Did he act through policy or weakness? Be that as it may, he complied at length, and the holy see was transferred from Avignon to Rome at the end of seventy years, only to involve Europe in new dissensions.

C H A P. LXXI.

Of the Great Schism of the West.

THE holy see at that time was in possession only of the patrimony of St. Peter in Tuscany, of the Campagna of Rome, the country of Viterbo and Orvieto, the province of Sabina, the dutchy of Spoleto, Benevento, and a small part of the marquisate of Ancona. All the other territories, which have been united since to the ecclesiastical state, were then subject to different lords, in the quality of vicars of the empire or of the holy see. Since the year 1138 the cardinals had usurped the privilege of excluding the people and the rest of the clergy from the election of the Roman pontiffs; and in 1216 they made a law, that two-thirds of the votes were necessary for a canonical election. At the time I am speaking of, there were only sixteen cardinals in Rome, eleven French, one Spanish, and four Italians. The Romans, notwithstanding their passion for liberty, and aversion to a master, were willing to have a pope that would reside at Rome, because they detested the Ultramontanes a great deal more than they did the pope, and because the presence of the pontiff was the means of drawing riches to their city. They threatened therefore to destroy the cardinals, if they chose a foreigner: at which the electors were so frightened, that they nominated Brigano, bishop of Bari, a Neapolitan, who¹³⁷⁸ took the name of Urban. The new pope was a man of an impetuous and severe temper, and consequently very unfit for such a dignity: he was no sooner installed than he declared in a full consistory, that he would punish the kings of France and England, Charles the Wise, and Edward III. who, he said, were disturbing all Christendom with their quarrels. The cardinal de la Grange, a man of as violent a temper as the pope himself, lifting up his hand in a menacing posture, told him, *he lied*; and these two words involved Europe in a confusion that lasted forty years.

Most

Most of the cardinals, and even the Italians themselves, were so offended with the fiery temper of a man so little qualified for government, that they withdrew to the kingdom of Naples, where they declared the pope's election void, as having been made by violence. After this they unanimously proceeded to the election of a new pontiff, when the French cardinals, which, by the bye, very rarely happens, had the satisfaction of outwitting their Italian brethren. They promised the tiara to each Italian in particular, and afterwards they elected Robert, son of Amadeus, count of Geneva, who took the name of Clement VII. Upon this Europe was divided: the emperor Charles IV. England, Flanders, and Hungary acknowledged Urban, whom Rome and Italy obeyed. France, Scotland, Savoy, and Lorrain declared for Clement. All the religious orders were divided; the doctors all wrote, and the universities issued out decrees. The two popes treated each other as usurpers and antichrists, and excommunicated each other reciprocally. But what was really melancholy, was, that they fought with the united fury of a
1379 civil and of a religious war. A body of troops, which Clement's nephew had raised in Gascony and Britany, marched into Italy, and took Rome by surprize, where, in their first fury, they killed all that came in their way. But the people of Rome recovering from their fright, quickly rallied, and a desperate engagement ensuing, they were all killed within the walls, and all the French priests in the city were destroyed at the same time. Soon after this another army of pope Clement's, which had been raised in the kingdom of Naples, appeared within a few leagues of Rome, and offered battle to the troops of pope Urban.

Each of these armies had the keys of St. Peter on their ensigns. The Clementine troops were defeated; yet the quarrel did not end here, for there were other interests to manage besides those of the two pontiffs. Urban intending part of the kingdom of Naples for his nephew, dethroned queen Joan the protectress of Clement, a princess who had reigned many years in
Naples

Naples with various success, but whose reputation had been stained by the murder of her husband.

We have seen this queen assassinated by her cousin Charles of Durazzo, with whom pope Urban wanted to share the kingdom of Naples. But this usurper was no sooner in quiet possession of the throne than he refused to perform his promise to a pontiff who was not strong enough to compel him. Urban, who had more warmth than policy, was so imprudent as to pay a visit to his vassal, though he knew himself inferior in strength, and was attended but with a slender retinue. The ancient ceremonial obliged the king to kiss the pope's feet, and to hold his horse by the bridle: Durazzo conformed to only one of these ceremonies; he laid hold of the bridle, but it was to conduct the pope to prison. Urban was kept for a while in confinement at Naples, continually negotiating with his vassal, who sometimes treated him with respect, and at other times with contempt. At length the pontiff made his escape out of prison, and retired to the little town of Nocera, where he collected the scattered remains of his court. The cardinals, and some bishops, were so tired with his morose temper, and still more with his misfortunes, that they concerted measures at Nocera for quitting him, in order to remove to Rome, and to chuse a person more worthy of wearing the pontifical crown. Urban having got intelligence of their design, ordered them all to be put to the torture in his presence. Being soon obliged to leave Nocera, he retired to the city of Genoa, from whence some galleys had been sent to escort him; dragging with him those poor cardinals and bishops in that maimed condition, and bound in fetters. One of the bishops, being half dead with the torments of the rack, and unable to get ashore time enough to please the pope, was murdered by the way. Urban was no sooner arrived at Genoa than he got rid of five of the cardinals by different punishments. The Caligulas and the Neros had been guilty of crimes of the like nature, but they met with their deserts, and Urban died peaceably in Rome. 1383

His

His creature and persecutor, Charles of Durazzo, was more unfortunate; for having made an expedition into Hungary, with an intent of seizing a crown which did not belong to him, he was assassinated in that country.

After the death of Urban this civil war seemed to be extinguished, but the Romans were far from acknowledging Clement. The schism therefore continued to prevail on both sides. The cardinals who had sided with Urban, elected Perin Tomasel, and upon the death of this Tomasel, they pitched upon cardinal Meliorati. On the other hand the Clementines chose Peter Luna, a native of Arragon, to succeed Clement, who died in 1390. Never had pope less power in Rome than Meliorati; and Peter Luna was soon no more than a cypher in Avignon. The Romans desirous of re-establishing their municipal government, expelled Meliorati after a great deal of bloodshed, notwithstanding that they acknowledged him as pope; and the French, who had acknowledged Peter Luna, laid siege to the
1402 city of Avignon, where they kept him prisoner.

In these unhappy times the states of France took so prudent a resolution, that I am surpris'd it was not followed by other nations. They acknowledged no pope at all; but each diocese was governed by its own bishop. They remitted no annats, and owned no reservations or exemptions; so that Rome was afraid lest that kind of administration, which continued some years, should last for ever.

Luna, before his election, had promised to resign his dignity, if necessary, for the sake of peace; but did not keep his word: a noble Venetian, named Corario, who was chosen at Rome, took the same oath, but did not keep it better. At length the cardinals on both sides being heartily tired with the general as well as private quarrels, with which the dispute about the tiara was attended, agreed to call a general council at Pisa. Twenty-four cardinals, twenty-six archbishops, one hundred and ninety-two bishops, two hundred and eighty-nine abbots, the deputies of all the universities, as also of the chapters of one hundred and two metro-
politan

politan churches, three hundred doctors of divinity, the grand master of Malta, and the ambassadors of all the Christian princes, were present at this assembly, in 1409 which they elected a new pope, named Peter Philargi, who took the name of Alexander V. but the result of this grand council was, that they had three popes, or antipopes, instead of two. The emperor Robert refused to acknowledge this council; so that the confusion was greater than ever.

It is impossible to read the history of the hard fate of Rome; they wanted to force a bishop and a prince upon her whether she would or not; and a body of French troops under the command of Tanegoi du Chatel, threatened to sack the city, unless she accepted of a third pope. Corario, the Venetian, transferred his residence to Gaieta, where he put himself under the protection of the son of Charles of Durazzo, who is known to us by the name of Lancelot, and who reigned at that time at Naples; and Peter Luna removed his see to Perpignan. Rome was plundered, but without any advantage to the third pope, who died by the way; and according to the politics which prevailed at that time, it was generally supposed that he had been poisoned.

The cardinals of the council of Pisa, who had elected him, having made themselves masters of Rome, chose for his successor Balthazar Cozza a Neapolitan. This new pope was a man of courage, who had been captain of a privateer, and distinguished himself in the war, which still continued between the son of Charles of Durazzo, and the house of Anjou: afterwards he was made legate in Germany, where he grew rich by the sale of indulgences. He bought at length a cardinal's hat, for which he paid a high price; nor did he make a cheaper purchase of Catherine his concubine, whom he took away from her own husband. In the situation Rome was in at that time she perhaps required a pope of this stamp, and stood more in need of a soldier than of a divine.

From the time of Urban V. the rival popes went on negotiating, and excommunicating, but confined their politics to the extorting of some money. This pope determined to wage war: he was acknowledged by France, and by the greatest part of Europe, under the name of John XXIII. He had no occasion to fear the pope of Perpignan; but the pope of Gaieta was formidable, because he was protected by the king of Naples. John XXIII. began with raising troops, publishing a crusade against Lancelot, and getting Louis of Anjou on his side by granting him the investiture of Naples. A battle was fought on the banks of the Garigliano, where the pope's party remained victorious. But gratitude not being the virtue of sovereigns, and reasons of state prevailing over every other consideration, the pope deprived his benefactor and defender, Louis of Anjou, of the investiture, and acknowledged Lancelot, his enemy, for king, on condition of his giving up to him Corario the Venetian.

Lancelot, unwilling that John XXIII. should grow too powerful, suffered pope Corario to make his escape. This wandering pontiff retired to the castle of Rimini, which belonged to Malatesta, one of the petty tyrants of Italy: here he subsisted intirely by the benevolence of this lord; and though he was acknowledged only by the duke of Bavaria, he excommunicated all the kings of Christendom, and spoke like the sovereign of the earth.

John XXIII. the only lawful pope, because he had been elected, and acknowledged at Rome by the cardinals of the council of Pisa, and had succeeded the pope chosen by the same council, was likewise the only pope in fact. But as he had betrayed his benefactor, Louis of Anjou; so Lancelot, king of Naples, whose benefactor he had been, betrayed him in like manner.

Lancelot, after his success, wanting to be master of Rome, surpris'd this unhappy city, and John XXIII. had hardly time to make his escape. It was lucky for the pontiff that there were at that time free cities in Italy. To throw himself, like Corario, into the hands

of one of the petty tyrants, would have been making himself a slave; he therefore put himself under the protection of the people of Florence, who fought against Lancelot, for their liberty, and for the pope.

Lancelot was carrying every thing before him; when the pope seeing himself besieged in Bologna, had recourse to the emperor Sigismond, who was come into Italy to conclude a treaty with the Venetians. Sigismond, as emperor, was likely to increase his power by the humiliation of the pope; and he was also the natural enemy of Lancelot, the tyrant of Italy. John XXIII. proposed to him to form a league, and to assemble a council; a league, in order to expel the common enemy, and a council to confirm his right to the pontificate. There was even a necessity for this assembly; for the council of Pisa had ordered it to be called at the end of three years. Sigismond and John accordingly issued out their summons for the holding of this council in the little city of Constance; but Lancelot baffled all these negotiations by the success of his arms. Nothing but an extraordinary incident could rid the emperor and the pope of so powerful an enemy; and such an event at length took place. Lancelot died¹⁴¹⁴ suddenly at the age of thirty in the most excruciating pains, and the practice of poisoning had the reputation at that time of being but too frequent.

The pope having got rid of his enemy, had no longer any thing more than the emperor and the council to fear; he would fain have delayed the meeting of this European senate, which has a power of judging upon the pontiffs themselves. But the convocation was announced, the emperor was desirous to see it take place, and those who had a right to assist at it were hastening from all parts to determine the disputes of Christendom.

C H A P. LXXII.

The Council of Constance.

ON the western bank of the lake of Constance, the city of that name is said to have been built by Constantine ; and Sigismond pitched upon it as the theatre where this great scene was to be acted. There never had been a convocation more numerous than that of Pisa ; but the council of Constance was much more so.

Besides the vast multitude of prelates and doctors, there were an hundred and twenty-eight great vassals of the empire. The emperor was present himself. The electors of Mentz, Saxony, Palatine and Brandenburg, with the dukes of Bavaria, Austria, and Silesia, assisted at this assembly ; seven and twenty sovereigns were represented by their ambassadors, who vied with each other in luxury and magnificence ; as we may infer from this circumstance, that fifty goldsmiths went to live in that city, together with their workmen, during the holding of the council. They reckoned five hundred musicians, and seven hundred and eighteen courtisans under the protection of the magistrates. They were obliged to build wooden huts in order to accommodate all those slaves of luxury and incontinency, who attended the lords, but not the fathers of the council. They were not at all ashamed of this custom ; it was authorized in every state, as it heretofore had the sanction of almost all antiquity. The church of France allowed to each archbishop, deputed to this assembly, ten livres a day (equivalent to about fifty livres of our present currency in France) eight to a bishop, five to an abbot, and three to a doctor.

Before I enter into the particulars of what was transacted in this general assembly of Christendom, it will be right to give a summary view of the chief princes who then reigned in Europe, and of the state and condition of their respective dominions.

Sigismond

Sigismond united the imperial dignity to the kingdom of Hungary : but he had been unsuccessful against 1393 the famous Bajazet, sultan of the Turks ; so that Hungary exhausted, and Germany divided, were both threatened with the Mahometan yoke. He had still been worse treated by his subjects, than by the Turks ; for the Hungarians had confined him, and offered the crown to Lancelot king of Naples. But he found means to escape out of prison, and having re- 1410 trieved his affairs in Hungary, he was at length chosen head of the empire.

In France, the unhappy Charles VI. being seized with a frenzy, enjoyed only the title of king : his relations were employed in rending and dismembering the kingdom, so that they concerned themselves but little about the council ; however, it was their interest that the emperor should not appear to be the master of Europe.

Ferdinand reigned in Arragon, and espoused the cause of his pope, Peter Luna.

John II. king of Castile, had no manner of influence in the affairs of Europe ; he continued however to side with Luna, and had made himself master of the kingdom of Navarre.

Henry V. king of England, being taken up, as we shall relate hereafter, with the conquest of France, was desirous to see the pontifical power intirely reduced, to the end that the see of Rome might never be able to extort money from England, nor to concern itself with the rights of crowned heads.

Rome being delivered from the French troops, which were still however in possession of the castle of St. Angelo, had acknowledged John XXIII. yet she disliked her pope, and was afraid of the emperor.

The cities of Italy were so divided, that they had hardly any weight in the scales. The republic of Venice aspiring at the sovereignty of Italy, took advantage of the troubles of that country, as well as of those of the church.

The

The duke of Bavaria, desirous of having some share in these transactions, protected pope Corario, who had taken refuge at Rimini; while Frederick, duke of Austria, a secret enemy to the emperor, thought only of traversing the designs of this prince.

Sigismond made himself master of the council, by placing soldiers round the city of Constance, for the safety, as he said, of the fathers. John XXIII. would have done better to have returned to Rome, where he might have been master, than to have put himself in the power of the emperor, who was able to ruin him. He entered into a confederacy with the duke of Austria, the archbishop of Mentz, and the duke of Burgundy; and this confederacy was the cause of his misfortunes. The emperor immediately became his enemy, and notwithstanding his being a lawful pope, he insisted on his resigning the tiara, as well as Luna and Corario. John solemnly promised to comply, but repented the moment after. He saw himself a prisoner in the midst of the very council over which he presided: the only resource left him was to make his escape; but the emperor caused him to be narrowly watched. The duke of Austria, willing to favour the pope's escape, could find no better way of effecting it, than to entertain the council with a tournament. In the midst of this festivity, the pope went off in a postilion's disguise, and the duke of Austria immediately followed him. They both retired to a part of Switzerland that belonged still to the house of Austria. The pope claimed the protection of the duke of Burgundy, a prince of great power, whether we consider his own territories, or the authority he had in France: thus a new schism was going to be kindled. The heads of the religious orders, who adhered to the pope, were already withdrawing from Constance; and such was the change of things, that the council was likely to become an assembly of rebels. Sigismond, who had been unsuccessful upon so many other occasions, was fortunate in this: having a body of troops at hand, he seized on the territories of the duke of Austria in Alsace, Tyrol, and Switzerland.

This

This obliged the duke to return to the council, where upon his knees he asked the emperor's pardon; and joining both his hands, he promised never to undertake any thing against his will: at the same time he resigned all his dominions to the emperor, to be disposed of as he should think proper, in case he should ever break his word. Sigismund at length stretched out his hand to the duke of Austria, and forgave him, on condition he would deliver up the pope.

The fugitive pontiff was arrested in Fribourg, and removed to a neighbouring castle: in the mean time the council proceeded in his trial.

They charged him with having sold benefices and relics; with having poisoned the pope his predecessor; with having murdered a multitude of innocent persons; with having been guilty of the most impious licentiousness, of the highest excess of debauchery, and even of sodomy and blasphemy: but they suppressed fifty articles of the verbal process, that were too injurious to the pontificate. At length the sentence of his deposition was read in the emperor's presence. It imported, that "The council reserved to itself a right of May
" punishing the pope for his crimes according to justice 29,
" or mercy." 1415

John XXIII. who had shewn so much courage, when he had formerly fought both by sea and land, was all resignation when they came to read his sentence to him in prison. The emperor kept him three years close confined in Manheim, where the severity with which he was treated, rendered him an object of compassion with the public, in a greater degree than his crimes had ever excited their hatred.

They had now deposed the lawful pope; and they wanted the renunciations of those who pretended to the pontificate. Corario sent them his; but the proud Spaniard Luna would never yield. The council was not so much troubled about deposing him, as about the election of a pope. The cardinals claimed the privilege to themselves: and the council acting as the representatives of the church, wanted to enjoy this right.

right. There was a necessity for giving a head to the Christian world, and a sovereign to Rome; and it was but just, that the cardinals who are the council of the prince of that city, and the fathers of the council, who in conjunction with them represent the church, should
 1417 all give their votes. The deputies of the council, in conjunction with the cardinals, unanimously elected Otho Colonna, of that same family which had been excommunicated by Boniface VIII. to the fifth generation. This pontiff, who changed his illustrious name for that of Martin, possessed the qualities of a prince and the virtues of a bishop.

Never was there a pope more pompously inaugurated: he marched towards the church, mounted on a white horse, the reins of which were held by the emperor and the elector Palatine on foot; a multitude of princes and the whole council closed the procession. He was crowned with the triple crowns, which the popes had wore for more than two centuries.

The fathers of the council did not meet at first in order to dethrone the pope; their principal view seemed to be the reformation of the church. This was chiefly the design of the famous Garson, and of the other deputies of the university of Paris.

Complaints had been made in the council for the space of two years against the annats, the exemptions, the reservations, the pontifical taxes upon the clergy for the benefit of the court of Rome, and, in short, against all the evils with which the church was at that time overwhelmed. But how did the long-expected reformation terminate? Pope Martin declared, 1. That no exemptions should be granted without knowledge of the cause. 2. That the benefices which had been reunited, should be inquired into. 3. That the revenues of vacant churches should be disposed of according to the public law. 4. He made an ineffectual prohibition of simony. 5. He ordained, that those who had benefices should be distinguished by the tonsure. 6. He forbade the celebrating of mass in a lay habit.

These

These were the laws promulged by the most solemn assembly in the universe.

It was with great difficulty that Gerson obtained the condemnation even of the following propositions: that there are cases wherein assassination is a virtuous action, far more meritorious in a knight than in a squire; and still much more so in a prince than in a knight. This doctrine of assassination had been publicly maintained by a doctor of the university of Paris, named John Petit, upon the murder of the king's own brother. The council for a long time evaded Gerson's petition: but at length they were obliged to condemn this doctrine of murder, though without mentioning the Franciscan John Petit by name.

Such is the idea which I thought it incumbent upon me to give of the several political views of the council of Constance: the fires which were there kindled by a religious zeal are of another kind.

C H A P. LXXIII.

Of John Huss, and Jerome of Prague.

ALL that we have hitherto seen in this sketch of general history, plainly shews into what ignorance the inhabitants of this western part of the world were fallen. The nations heretofore subject to the Romans, became barbarians at the extinction of the empire; and the others had ever been such. To read and write was a very extraordinary accomplishment before the reign of Frederick II. and the famous benefit of the clergy, by which a condemned criminal obtained his pardon in case he could read, is the strongest proof of the brutal ignorance of those days. In proportion to the ignorance of the vulgar, learning, but especially religious learning, invested churchmen with that authority, which teachers, in consequence of their superior knowledge, have naturally over their disciples. From this authority

arose power. There was not a bishop in Germany, or in the North, who was not a sovereign: not one in Spain, France, or England; but was possessed of, or disputed the right of the regale. Almost every abbot was become a prince; and the popes, though persecuted, were the kings of all those sovereigns. The vices attendant on luxury, and the disorders which follow ambition, at length reduced the greatest part of the bishops and abbots to the ignorant state of the laity. The universities of Bologna, Paris, and Oxford, which had been founded towards the thirteenth century, cultivated that learning which had been forsaken by the opulent clergy.

The doctors of these universities, I mean such as were only doctors, soon exclaimed against the scandalous lives of the rest of the clergy; and the desire of distinguishing themselves, was the cause of their prying into mysteries, which for the public peace should never have been unveiled.

He who rent the veil with the greatest fury, was John Wickliff, doctor of the university of Oxford: he preached, he wrote, while Urban V. and Clement were ravaging the church by their schism. He pretended that what France had done only for a while, by acknowledging no pope, should be established as a constant law. This notion was approved by a great many English lords, who had long with indignation beheld their country treated as a Roman province; but it was opposed by all those who shared the benefit of this submission.

Wickliff was not so much protected in his theology as in his politics: he revived the old opinions of Berenger, which had been formerly proscribed: he maintained, that we must believe nothing impossible or contradictory; that no effect can take place without a cause; that it is not possible for the same body to be at one and the same time in a hundred thousand different places; that such tenets could not fail to destroy the faith of those who had any share of reason; and, in a word, that the substance of the bread and wine

wine remains in the Eucharist. He wanted likewise to abolish the auricular confession, which had been introduced into the western church; indulgences, by which the priesthood might be said to sell the justice of God; and likewise the ecclesiastical hierarchy, as being repugnant to the simplicity of the primitive Christians. The tenets which the Vaudois heretofore taught in private, he delivered in public; and his doctrine was nearly the same as that of the Protestants, who appeared a century after him, and of more societies than one of much greater antiquity.

His doctrine was censured by the university of Oxford, by the bishops, and clergy; but this did not suppress it. His manuscripts, notwithstanding the obscurity and badness of their stile, were spread abroad, numbers being prompted to read them merely from the nature of the quarrel, and the boldness of the author, whose irreproachable morals gave some weight to his opinions. These works made their way even into Bohemia, a country just then emerged from a barbarous state, and which from the grossest ignorance was changing to another kind of ignorance, at that time known by the name of erudition.

The emperor Charles IV. the legislator of Germany and Bohemia, had founded an university at Prague, upon the same plan as that of Paris. We are told, that at the beginning of the fifteenth century they had near twenty thousand students. The Germans had three votes in the resolutions of the academy, and the Bohemians but one. John Hufs, a native of Bohemia, and who after taking a batchelor's degree in this university, was made confessor to the queen Sophia of Bavaria, wife of Wenceslaus, obtained of the queen that his countrymen, on the contrary, should have three votes, and the Germans but one. The latter, who were disgusted at this, quitted the university, and were ever after implacable enemies to Hufs. About this very time he received some of Wickliff's works: he rejected the speculative doctrines of that Englishman, but adopted all his passionate invectives against

the scandalous lives of the popes and the bishops, against the excommunications thundered out with such levity and fury, and, in fine, against the ecclesiastical power, the rights and usurpations of which neither he nor Wickliff had properly ascertained. By this behaviour he made himself more enemies; but he likewise acquired more protectors, and among the rest the queen, whose conscience he directed. He was accused before pope John XXIII. and summoned to appear towards the year 1411, but refused to obey the summons. In the mean time the council of Constance assembled, which was to pronounce judgment upon the popes, and upon the opinions of men: and here 1414 he was also cited. The emperor himself wrote to the court of Bohemia, that they should send him to the council, in order to give an account of his doctrine.

John Huss, full of confidence, repaired to this assembly, from which both he and the pope ought in prudence to have kept away. He arrived there in company with some Bohemian gentlemen, and many of his disciples: but what is most remarkable, he came there with the emperor's safe conduct, dated the 18th of October 1414, and drawn up in the most favourable and the most ample terms, and in which the emperor undertook to protect him upon his journey, during his stay, as also in his return. He was no sooner arrived however, than they made him a close prisoner, and proceeded to try him at the same time as they tried the pope. He ran away, as the pope did, and like him was retaken. For some time they were both confined in the same prison.

At length he appeared before them loaded with chains; and was examined concerning several passages in his 1415 writings. It is certain, that there is no man but may be ruined, by wresting the meaning of his words. What doctor, what writer is sure of his life, if we condemn to the flames a person who says, "That there is only one catholic church, which contains all the predestined in its bosom; that a reprobate is not a member

“ member of this church ; that it is the duty of the
“ temporal lords to oblige the priests to observe the
“ law ; and that a bad pope is not the vicar of Jesus
“ Christ ? ”

And yet these were the propositions maintained by John Hufs : he explained them all in such a manner as might have acquitted him ; but the council understood them in such a sense as was found necessary to condemn him. One of the fathers said to him, “ If
“ you do not believe the *universale a parte rei*, you do
“ not believe in the real presence.” What a way of arguing ! and on how precarious a thing did men’s lives at that time depend ! Another of the fathers said to him, “ If the sacred council should pronounce you
“ blind, it would not signify that you had two eyes in
“ your head : you must acknowledge yourself blind.”

John Hufs had adopted none of those propositions of Wickliff, which divide the protestants from the church of Rome ; and yet he was condemned to the flames. Inquiring into the cause of this execution, I could never find it to be any other than that spirit of obstinacy which is generally learnt in the schools. The fathers of the council absolutely insisted upon John Hufs’s retracting ; and John, convinced of his being in the right, would not acknowledge himself in an error. The emperor, moved with compassion, said to him, “ What
“ harm is there in abjuring errors falsely imputed to
“ you ? I am ready at this very moment to abjure all
“ manner of errors : but does it follow from thence
“ that I held them ? ” Hufs was inflexible : he shewed the emperor the difference between a general abjuration of errors, and retracting an error : he chose rather to be committed to the flames, than to acknowledge he had been in the wrong.

The council was no less inflexible : but the obstinacy of encountering certain death had something in it that was heroical ; whereas that of condemning him to death was an act of cruelty. The emperor, notwithstanding the faith of his safe conduct, ordered the elector Palatine to drag him to the place of execution, where he

was burnt alive in the presence of the elector himself, singing the Divine praises till he was silenced by the flames.

Some months afterwards, the council exercised the same severity against Jerome the disciple and friend of John Hufs, whom we commonly call Jerome of Prague. He was a man far superior to John Hufs in understanding and eloquence. At first he signed the condemnation of his master's doctrine; but hearing with what magnanimity John had encountered death, he was ashamed to live; he therefore made a public retraction, and was consigned to the flames. Poggio, a Florentine, secretary to John XXIII. and one of the first restorers of letters, who was present at his interrogatories, and his execution, says, that he never heard any thing so nearly approach to the eloquence of the Greeks and Romans, as the speech which Jerome made to his judges: "He spoke, says he, like Socrates, and walked to the stake with as much cheerfulness, as Socrates shewed when he drank the cup of hemlock."

Since Poggio has drawn this comparison, may I be permitted to add, that Socrates was in reality condemned like John Hufs and Jerome of Prague, for having incurred the displeasure of the sophists and priests of his time. But, how great the difference between the manners of Athens, and those of the council of Constance; between a cup of mild poison, which, far from being attended with any apparatus of terror or infamy, suffered a citizen to expire quietly in the midst of his friends; and the dreadful punishment of fire, into which the priests, those ministers of mercy and peace, threw other priests, their brethren, who had been doubtless too obstinate, but were men, at the same time, of innocent lives, and endowed with admirable courage.

May I be permitted also to observe, that in the proceedings of this council, a man who had been charged with all manner of crimes, was only divested of his honours;

honours; while two men accused of having made false reasonings, were sentenced to the flames.

Such was the famous council of Constance, which lasted from the 1st of November, 1413, to the 20th of May, 1418.

Neither the emperor, nor the fathers of the council foresaw the consequences of the execution of John Huss and Jerome of Prague. A civil war arose as it were out of their ashes; for the Bohemians considering this outrage as a national injury, imputed the death of their countrymen to the revenge of the Germans, who had withdrawn from the university of Prague. They likewise reproached the emperor with having violated the law of nations. And not long after, when Sigismund¹⁴¹⁹ wanted to succeed to his brother Wenceslaus in the kingdom of Bohemia, he found, that notwithstanding his power as emperor of Germany, and king of Hungary, yet the death of two citizens precluded his accession to the throne of Prague. The avengers of John Huss were no less than forty thousand men; a sort of animals whom the severity of the council had rendered wild, and let loose upon the public.

Every priest they met with, atoned with his blood for the cruelty of the fathers of the council of Constance. John, surnamed *Ziska*, from his being *blind of one eye*, defeated Sigismund in several battles. This same *Ziska*, having lost the only eye he had left, in an engagement, still continued to head his troops, giving his directions to the general officers, and assisting in their victories. He gave orders, that after his death they should make a drum of his skin, which they obeyed: and these very remains of *Ziska* proved a long time fatal to Sigismund, who, with difficulty, in the space of sixteen years, recovered Bohemia, though assisted by the forces of Germany and the terror of crusades. Thus the violating his safe conduct was productive of sixteen years desolation.

C H A P. LXXIV.

Of the State of Europe, towards the Time of the Council of Constance.—Of Italy.

WHEN we reflect on this very council, held in the presence of the emperor, and of so many princes and ambassadors, and consider the deposition of the supreme pontiff, and that of Wenceslaus, we may perceive that the catholic part of Europe, was in fact an immense and tumultuous republic, whose chiefs were the pope and the emperor, and whose disunited members consisted of kingdoms, provinces and free cities, under twenty different governments. There was no sort of public affairs in which the pope and the emperor did not concern themselves; and all the parts of Christendom were in correspondence with each other even in the midst of discord. In short, if we except the difference of extent and politeness, the state of Europe at the time I am speaking of, might be compared to that of ancient Greece.

Rome and Rhodes were two cities in common to all the Christians of the Latin church; and they had a common enemy in the sultan of the Turks. The two chiefs of the catholic world, the emperor and the pope, had an imaginary greatness, but no real power. If Sigismund had not been possessed of the crowns of Bohemia and Hungary, from which however he received no great revenue, the title of emperor would have been a burden to him. The demesnes of the empire were all alienated. The princes and imperial cities paid no tax nor tribute. The Germanic body was as free, but not so well regulated, as it has been since by the treaty of Westphalia. The title of king of Italy was as empty as that of king of Germany: for the emperor did not possess so much as a single city beyond the Alps.

How it happened that the Italians did not establish their liberty, and for ever exclude all strangers from
setting

setting foot in their country, is still a hard problem to solve. They endeavoured at it; and there was a probability of their succeeding. Italy was then in a flourishing state. The house of Savoy was increasing its territory, without being, as yet, formidable. The sovereigns of this province were counts, who paid homage to the empire. Sigismond, who could give titles, if nothing else, made them dukes in 1416. Now they are independent kings, notwithstanding the title of feudatories. The Viscontis were possessed of the whole Milanese, a country which afterwards grew more considerable under the Sforzas.

The industrious Florentines were distinguished for their liberty, genius and commerce. All the petty states, as far as the frontiers of Naples were aspiring to liberty. This system of Italy lasted from the death of Frederick II. to the times of pope Alexander VI. and Julius II. a period of about three hundred years. But these three hundred years were spent in factions, jealousies, and the encroachment of one town upon another, or in the usurpations of petty tyrants. This is a picture of ancient Greece; but it is a barbarous picture. They cultivated the arts, and they plotted, but they did not know how to fight as the Greeks did at Thermopylæ and Marathon.

Look into Machiavel for the history of Castracani, the tyrant of Lucca and Pistoia, in the reign of the emperor Louis of Bavaria. Success or disappointment in similar attempts, constitute the history of every part of Italy. Read the life of Ezzelino d'Aromana, the tyrant of Padua, which is so naturally and so well written by Pietro Gerardo, his cotemporary. This writer asserts, that the tyrant put to death upwards of twelve thousand citizens of Padua in the thirteenth century. The pope's legate, who fought against him, put to death at least as many of the inhabitants of Vicenza, Verona and Ferrara. Ezzelino was at length taken prisoner, and all his family perished by the most cruel torments. A family of the city of Verona, whose name was Scala, and whom the French call l'Escale, seized the government towards the end of the thirteenth century, and reigned there one

hundred years. This family, towards the year 1330, subdued Padua, Vicenza, Trevigi, Parma, Brescia, and other territories. But in the fifteenth century there was not the least vestige of this power. The Viscontis, and the Sforzas, dukes of Milan, appeared later on the stage, and soon vanished. Of all the lords who were in possession of the several parts of Romagna, Umbria and Emilia, there are not above two or three families remaining, who are now subject to the pope.

If you peruse the annals of the cities of Italy you will not find one, in which there have not been conspiracies, conducted with as much art as that of Catiline. In those petty states they could not raise armies either to attack or to defend: these were often supplied by assassinations and poisonings. A popular insurrection raised a person to the sovereignty: another deposed him. Thus it was that Mantua, for instance, passed from tyrant to tyrant, till at length in 1328, the house of Gonzaga settled themselves in that principality.

Venice alone has always preserved her liberty, for which she is indebted to the sea that environs her, and to the prudence of her government. Genoa, her rival, waged war against her, and proved victorious towards the end of the fourteenth century: but Genoa afterwards declined daily, while Venice gradually rose till the time of Louis XII. and the emperor Maximilian, when we shall find her intimidating all Italy, and exciting the jealousy of the several powers that conspire against her. Of all the governments in Europe that of Venice was the only one that could be said to be well regulated, stable and uniform. It had but one radical defect, which was not however such in the eye of the senate; it wanted a counterpoise to the patrician power, and an encouragement to the plebeians. In Venice no merit can raise a private citizen, as in ancient Rome. The beauty of the English constitution, since the house of commons have had a share in the legislature, consists in this counterpoise, the road to preferment being ever open to those who deserve it.

Pisa, though at present only a depopulated city and dependent on Tuscany, was in the thirteenth and fourteenth

teenth centuries, a famous republic, which fitted out as numerous fleets as Genoa.

Parma and Placentia belonged to the Visconti. The popes being reconciled to that family, granted them the investiture of these territories, because the Visconti would not ask it of the emperor, whose power at that time was extinct in Italy. The house of Este, which has produced the celebrated benefactress of the holy see, the countess Matilda, was possessed of Ferrara and Modena. It held Ferrara of the emperor Otho III, yet the pope claimed some right to this city, and sometimes granted the investiture of it, as well as of several territories in Romagna, which proved an eternal source of confusion and dispute.

We may observe, that during the transmigration of the holy see from the banks of the Tiber to those of the Rhone, there were two imaginary powers in Italy, the emperor and the pope, of whom all the other princes received their diplomas to ascertain their rights or usurpation: and when the pontifical chair was restored to Rome, the popes had no real power; while the emperors were almost forgotten till the reign of Maximilian. No foreigner at that time possessed any dominions in Italy. The house of Anjou, which had been settled at Naples in 1266, and that of Arragon, which had enjoyed the sovereignty of Sicily since 1287, could no longer be called foreigners. Thus Italy abounding in riches, adorned with a number of flourishing cities, and fruitful in men of genius, might have put herself into such a state of defence as no longer to receive the law from foreign nations. She had even this advantage over Germany, that not one bishop, except the pope, had erected a sovereignty; and all those different states being subject to secular princes, were consequently much fitter for military operations.

If Italy was disturbed by divisions, which sometimes are productive of public liberty, the situation of Germany was not less confused, all the great lords of that country having pretensions upon each other. But Italy, as we have already observed, never formed one body as

Germany did. The Germanic phlegm has hitherto preserved the constitution of their country sound and intire; while Italy, though of less extent than Germany, could never mould itself into any kind of constitution: so that by its cunning and finesse it is divided into several petty states, which have been subdued by foreign nations.

Naples and Sicily, which under the Norman conquerors had been a formidable power, were now two separate states, jealous of each other, and avowed enemies, since the Sicilian vespers. The foibles of Joan I. ruined Naples and Provence, of which she was sovereign. Those of Joan II. which were still more scandalous, completed their ruin. This queen, the last of the family which St. Louis's brother transplanted into Italy, had no sort of credit or influence in her kingdom, during her whole reign. She was sister of that very Lancelot who made Rome tremble in the times of confusion that preceded the council of Constance: but Joan II. was far from being formidable. Her amours, and the intrigues of her court, proved the disgrace and ruin of her dominions. James of Bourbon, her second husband, experienced her infidelity; and when he complained of it he was sent to prison. He had the good fortune to make his escape, when, to conceal his grief, and what the world calls shame, he shut himself up in a convent of Cordeliers at Besançon.

This Joan II. was, unintentionally the cause of two great events. The first was the elevation of the Sforzas to the dukedom of Milan. The second was the war, which Charles VIII. and Louis XII. carried into Italy. The elevation of the Sforzas is one of those sports of fortune, which convince us that this world is made only for those who have power on their side. A peasant named Jacomuzio, who had been a soldier, and who changed his name for that of Sforza, rose to be the queen's favourite, constable of Naples, and standard-bearer to the church; in which posts he accumulated so much wealth, that after his death one of his bastards was enabled to conquer the dutchy of Milan.

The second event, so fatal to Italy and to France, was caused by adoptions. We have already seen how Joan I. adopted Louis I. of the second branch of Anjou, brother of Charles V. king of France. These adoptions were a remainder of the old Roman law: they conferred the right of succession, and the adopted prince was considered as a son; but the consent of the barons was requisite. Joan II. adopted first of all Alphonso V. of Arragon, by the Spaniards surnamed the *wise, and the magnanimous*. No sooner was this wise and magnanimous prince acknowledged the heir of Joan, than he divested her of all authority, sent her to prison, and was going to take away her life. Francis Sforza, the son of that illustrious peasant Jacomuzio, signalized his early years, and merited the grandeur to which he afterwards rose, by setting the benefactress of his father at liberty. Upon this the queen adopted Louis of Anjou, grandson of him who had been so ineffectually adopted by Joan I. After the death of this prince, in 1435, she appointed René of Anjou, brother of the deceased, her heir. This double adoption was long a source of discord between France and Spain. René of Anjou, who was called to the sovereignty of Naples by an adoptive mother, and to that of Lorrain by his wife, proved unfortunate in both. We find him stiled, *King of Naples, Sicily, Jerusalem, Arragon, Valentia, Majorca, and Duke of Lorrain and Bar*: yet he was in fact neither of these. This multiplicity of useless titles, founded on pretensions that never had any effect, is a source of confusion in our modern histories, which oftentimes renders them disagreeable, if not ridiculous. The history of Europe is become an immense register of marriages, genealogies, and disputed titles, which render the narrative obscure and unentertaining, at the same time that they stifle the memory of great events, together with the knowledge of laws and manners, objects far more worthy of our attention.

C H A P. LXXV.

Of France and England during the Reigns of Philip of Valois, Edward II. and Edward III.—Edward II. deposed by his Parliament.—Edward III. conquers France.—Of the Salic Law.—Of the Artillery.

TOWARDS the end of the thirteenth century England was beginning to recover its strength under Edward I. This prince, who succeeded his father Henry III. was indeed obliged to relinquish Normandy, Anjou, and Touraine, the patrimony of his ancestors; but still he preserved Guienne, and made himself master of the principality of Wales. He knew how to check the temper of the English, and how to animate them; he likewise made their commerce flourish, as far as was possible at that time. The house of Scotland being extinct in 1291, he had the glory of being chosen arbitrator by the pretenders to that crown. He began by obliging the parliament of Scotland to acknowledge that their crown was dependent on England; and afterwards he nominated Baliol king, whom he made his vassal. At length he took possession of Scotland for himself, having conquered it in several battles, but he could not keep it. Then began that antipathy between the English and the Scotch, which, notwithstanding the union of the two crowns, is not yet altogether extinguished.

Under this prince it began to appear that the English would not be long tributary to Rome; for they made use of pretences to excuse their backward payment, and they eluded an authority which they could not as yet venture to attack openly.

About the year 1300, the English parliament assumed a new form, very near the same as it now wears. The title of barons and peers was appropriated only to those who sat in the upper house. The commons began to regulate the supplies, and Edward I. gave a weight to the lower house, in order to balance the power of the

the barons. This prince, who had steadiness and abilities sufficient to manage and not to fear them, formed that kind of government which unites all the advantages of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy; but which has likewise the inconveniencies of all three, and cannot subsist but under a prudent king: his son was not such, and England was rent in pieces.

Edward I. died as he was going once more to conquer Scotland, which had been already thrice subdued, and had thrice shaken off the yoke. His son, who was 23 years of age, though at the head of a numerous army, abandoned his father's schemes to resign himself up to pleasures, which seemed more unbecoming a king of England than any other sovereign. His favourites irritated the whole nation, and particularly the queen, Isabella, daughter of Philip the Fair, a wanton, imperious woman, jealous of her husband, whom she dishonoured. The public administration was then only a scene of fury, confusion, and weakness. A party in the parliament caused a favourite of the monarch's, whose name was Gaveston, to be beheaded. The Scotch took an advantage of these troubles; they beat the English, and Robert Bruce being made king¹³¹² of Scotland, restored that monarchy by the weakness of England.

It is impossible to act more imprudently, and of course more unfortunately than Edward II. He suffered his wife Isabella, incensed against him, to go over to France with her son, who was afterwards the fortunate¹³¹⁶ and the celebrated Edward III.

Charles the Fair, brother of Isabella, reigned at that time in France. This prince followed the policy of all kings, which is to sow discord among their neighbours; in short, he encouraged his sister Isabella to carry on a war against her husband.

Thus, under the pretence that the king of England was in base subjection to a young favourite, named Spencer, the queen was preparing to wage war. She married her son to a daughter of the count of Hainault and Holland, and persuaded this count to supply her with

with troops. At length we find her repassing into England, and joining the enemies of her husband with armed force. Mortimer, her gallant, appeared with her at the head of the troops, while the king fled before them with his favourite Spencer.

The queen ordered this favourite's father, an old man of ninety, to be hanged at Bristol; and she afterwards 1326 inflicted the same punishment at Hereford upon the favourite himself, who fell into her hands.

In this punishment the queen adopted a species of revenge, which the rules of decency now-a-days would certainly not permit. She caused it to be inserted in the sentence pronounced against the younger Spencer, that he should have those parts cut off, of which he had made a criminal use with the king. This part of the sentence was executed upon him at the gallows, and she had the courage to be present while it was performing. Froissard makes no difficulty of calling these parts by their proper names. There is a great difference between those days and the present civilized times.

At length the king, abandoned by all the world, and a fugitive in his own kingdom, was taken prisoner, removed to London, insulted by the populace, confined in the Tower, tried by the parliament, and, by a solemn sentence, deposed from the throne.

One Treffel made known to him his deposition in these words, which are still preserved in the public acts: "I William Treffel, in the name of the men of the land of England, and of all the parliament, procurator, resign to thee Edward the homage that was made to thee some time since; and from this time forward now following, I defie thee, and prive thee of all thy royal power; and I shall never be tendant on thee as king, from this time." The crown was given to his son, who was only fourteen years of age, and the regency to his mother. A pension of twelve hundred marks was allowed the king during life.

Edward hardly lived a year after his disgrace. There were no marks of violence found on his body after his death;

death; but it is said, that they ran a red hot iron into¹³²⁷ his bowels through a tube of horn.

Edward III. soon punished his mother: he was yet a minor; but being impatient and capable of reigning, he one day seized on the person of his mother's gallant, Mortimer, earl of March, in her own presence: and¹³³¹ the parliament condemned this favourite without hearing him, in the same manner as the Spencers had been treated. He died by the hands of the common executioner, not for having dishonoured the bed of his sovereign, or for having dethroned and murdered him, but for the extortions and misdemeanors of which the ministers of state are generally accused. The queen was confined in the castle of Rising*, with a pension of 500l. sterling†, where she wept in solitude, more for her misfortunes than for her sins.

Edward III. being thus master, and soon absolute¹³³² master of the kingdom, began with the conquest of Scotland, when a new scene disclosed itself in France. All Europe, in suspense, waited to see whether Edward would acquire this kingdom by the right of blood, or by the sword.

France, which contained neither Provence, nor Dauphiny, nor Franche-Comté, was still a formidable kingdom, though its* king was not yet possessed of much power. The large dominions, such as Burgundy, Artois, Flanders, Britany, and Guienne, which were held as fiefs of the crown, contributed more to the uneasiness than to the grandeur of the prince.

The demesnes of Philip the Fair, with the imposts on his immediate subjects, amounted to an hundred and sixty thousand marks. When this prince went to war with the Flemings in 1302, and almost all the vassals of France were obliged to contribute to the expence of

* In Norfolk.

† Writers differ as to the amount of this pension. Rapin says it was only one hundred pounds; there are others who assert that it was a thousand; and Knighton tells us it was 3000l. T.

this armament, those who did not perform the campaign were obliged to pay the fifth part of their annual income. The people were unhappy, and the royal family was still more so. Few readers can be ignorant of the infamy to which the three sons of Philip the Fair exposed themselves at the same time, by accusing their wives of adultery before the parliament. These ladies were all three condemned to close confinement; Louis Hutin the elder brother strangled his wife, Margaret of Burgundy; and the lovers of those princesses were sentenced to a new kind of punishment, to be dead alive. What times! and yet we still complain of those in which we live.

- 1316 After the death of Louis X. who, like his father, had annexed Navarre to France, the public was entirely taken up with the question concerning the Salic law. This king had left only one daughter; and they had never examined in France whether the females were capable of inheriting the crown. Laws had been enacted only according to the present occasion; they had no knowledge of the ancient Salic laws; the want of them had been supplied by the establishment of customs, and these customs were continually varying in France. The Parliament under Philip the Fair had adjudged the province of Artois to a female in prejudice to the next male heir. The succession of Champagne had been sometimes settled upon the females, and at other times taken from them. Philip the Fair took possession of Champagne merely in right of his wife, by whom the princes of the family were excluded. This sufficiently proves, that right varied according to power, and that it was far from being a fundamental law of the state to exclude a daughter from her father's throne.

To say, as so many authors have done, *that the crown of France is so noble, that it cannot admit of women*, is, I think, quite puerile. And to pretend with Mezeray, *that the weakness of the sex does not permit women to reign*, is doubly unjust. The regency of queen Blanche, and the glorious reigns of so many other

other women in almost every country in Europe, are sufficient to refute this assertion of Mezeray. Besides, the article of this ancient law, which deprives the females of the right of inheriting in the Salic land, seems to be founded on this, that every Salic lord was obliged to appear in arms at the public assembly of the nation. Now a queen is not obliged to bear arms; the nation does it for her: hence it may be affirmed, that the Salic law, a regulation in other respects so little known, was relative to the other fiefs, and not to the crown. It was indeed so far from being a law, in regard to kings, that it has been often digested under the title of *allodia*, or *freeholds*. If it was a law of the ancient Salii, it must therefore have been made before there were kings of France; consequently could have no relation to these kings.

Again, it is indubitable, that several fiefs were not subject to this law; and by a much stronger reason might it be said, that the crown ought not to be subject to it.

It has always been a custom to strengthen opinions, of whatsoever kind, by the authority of the sacred writings. They who argued in favour of the Salic law, quoted this passage from scripture, "*The lilies toil not, neither do they spin;*" and from hence concluded, that as it was the business of the females to spin, they ought not to reign in the kingdom of lilies; and yet the lilies do not toil, and a sovereign must. The lions of England, and the towers of Castile*, do not spin any more than the lilies of France; and yet women may succeed in those two kingdoms. Moreover, the armorial bearings of the kings of France bear no resemblance to lilies; they appear plainly to be the heads of the old-fashioned pikes or halberds, as we find them described in the following bad verse of William the Breton; *Cuspidis in medio uncum emittit acutum*, the shield of France has an iron spike in the midst of the halberd.

* Alluding to the arms of England and Spain. T.

All the arguments against the Salic law were maintained with no little obstinacy by the duke of Burgundy, uncle of the princess, daughter of Louis X. and by several princes of the blood. Louis X. had two brothers, who in a short space of time, succeeded him one after the other: the eldest was Philip the Long, and the youngest Charles the Fair. Charles at that time not thinking that he was so near to the crown, attacked the Salic law out of jealousy to his brother.

Philip the Long took care to have it declared at a meeting of some barons, prelates, and citizens of Paris, that the females ought to be excluded from the crown of France. But had the opposite party prevailed, they would soon have made a fundamental law to the contrary.

Philip the Long, who is scarce known but by having excluded the bishops from sitting in parliament, died after a very short reign, and left no male issue. The Salic law was then confirmed a second time; and Charles the Fair, who had opposed it, succeeded to the crown without any manner of dispute, and excluded his brothers's daughters.

At the death of Charles the Fair, the same cause was to be again decided; the queen was with child, and a regent was wanting to the kingdom. Edward III. pretended to the regency, as grandson of Philip the Fair by his mother's side; and Philip of Valois took possession of it in quality of first prince of the blood. The regency was solemnly conferred upon him; and upon the queen dowager's being brought to-bed of a daughter, he ascended the throne with the consent of the nation. The Salic law, which excludes the females from the crown, was therefore impressed in their hearts, and might be deemed fundamental in virtue of an ancient and universal agreement. There is no other way to account for it. Laws of this sort are made by the bulk of the people, and by them repealed. Who can pretend to question but that if there remained of the royal blood of France only one princess

princess worthy to reign, the nation could and ought to give her the crown?

Not only the daughters were excluded from the succession, but the representative of a daughter's family. It was pretended that king Edward could not possess a right by his mother, which she herself had not. But there was a more cogent reason for preferring a prince of the blood to a foreigner, the native of a country naturally an enemy to France. At that time Philip of Valois had the surname of *Fortunate* given him: he might also for a while have been called the *Victorious* and the *Just*; for his vassal, the earl of Flanders, having by his oppressive treatment, provoked his subjects to revolt, he marched to the assistance of this prince; and when the rebellion was quelled, he said to him, "Take care not to cause any more revolts by your ill conduct."

He might still be called the *Fortunate*, when he received at Amiens the solemn homage yielded to him by Edward III. But this homage was soon followed by a war; Edward disputing the crown with Philip, after he had declared himself his vassal.

A brewer of the city of Ghent was the chief promoter of this famous war, and the man who determined Edward to take the title of king of France. This brewer, whose name was James of Artevelt, was one of those subjects whom princes ought either to ruin, or to keep fair with. The prodigious weight he had in his country, rendered him a fit tool for Edward; but he refused to exert his weight in favour of the king of England, unless he would take upon him the title of king of France, in order to make an irreconcilable breach between the two monarchs. Edward and the brewer signed the treaty at Ghent, long before hostilities had commenced against France. The emperor, Louis of Bavaria, joined the king of England with more pomp than the brewer, but with less advantage to Edward.

And here I would have you attentively remark the prejudice which prevailed at that time in the German republic,

republic, dignified with the title of Roman empire. This Louis the emperor, who was only in possession of Bavaria, invested king Edward III. in the city of Cologne, with the dignity of vicar of the empire, in the presence of almost all the German and English princes. On this occasion Louis declared the king of France to be disloyal and perfidious, and to have forfeited the protection of the empire. This was secretly declaring Philip of Valois and Edward to be his vassals.

The English monarch soon perceived that the title of vicar was as empty in itself as that of emperor, when not supported by the Germanic body; and he conceived such a dislike to the German anarchy, that when he was afterwards offered the empire, he rejected it with disdain.

The beginning of this war afforded a proof of that superiority which the English nation might one day have at sea. Edward was at first to endeavour to land in France with a powerful army, and Philip to hinder him. Both monarchs fitted out, in a very short time, a fleet of an hundred ships each. These ships, however, were nothing more than large barks. Edward was not, at that time, like the French king, sufficiently rich to build them at his own expence. Of the hundred English ships, twenty only belonged to him, the rest were furnished by the sea-port towns in England. That country was then so poor in specie, that the pay of the prince of Wales was no more than twenty shillings per day; that of the bishop of Durham, one of the admirals, only six; and the barons had but four each; however, the poorest side conquered the richest, as is almost always the case. Sea-fights, in those days, were more bloody than they are at present. They did not indeed use cannon, which makes so much noise, but there were many more killed on all sides. The ships boarded each other at the prow, and then letting down a kind of draw bridge, the crews of each fought as upon dry ground. Philip's admirals lost seventy ships and near twenty thousand men. This was the prelude

to the glory of Edward, and his son, the celebrated Black Prince, who gained this memorable battle in their own persons.

I shall wave entering into any detail of the military operations, in which there is generally a great sameness; but still confining myself to what characterizes the manners of the times, I shall observe, that Edward challenged to fight Philip of Valois; the king of France, however, declined the challenge, saying, that it did not become a lord paramount to fight his vassal.

In the mean time there happened a new event, which seemed also to subvert the Salic law. Britany, a fief of the crown of France, had been lately adjudged by the court of peers to Charles of Blois, who had married the daughter of the last duke; and the count of Montfort, this duke's uncle, had been disinherited. The laws were at variance with the interests of princes. The king of France, who, one would think, should have maintained the Salic law in favour of the count of Montfort, the male heir of the house of Britany, sided with Charles of Blois, who claimed by the females; and the king of England, who ought to have supported the right of the females in Charles of Blois, declared for the count of Montfort. 1341

Upon this occasion hostilities commenced between France and England. Montfort was at first taken by surprize in Nantz, and brought prisoner to Paris, where he was confined in the Tower of the Louvre. His wife, the daughter of the earl of Flanders, was one of those singular heroines that have appeared but rarely in the world, and whose exploits certainly gave rise to the fable of the Amazons. Putting herself at the head of her husband's troops, with a sword in her hand, a helmet on her head, and with her young son in her arms, she bravely defended the town of Hennebon, made sallies, fought in the breach, and, at length, with the assistance of the English fleet, which came to her support, obliged the enemy to raise the siege,

In

In the mean time the English and French parties
 Aug. carried on the war in Guienne, Britany and Normandy.

26, At length, near the river Somme was fought the bloody
 1346 battle of Crecy betwixt Edward and Philip of Valois.

Edward had with him his son the prince of Wales, who was called the Black Prince, because of his brown armour, and the black plume of feathers in his helmet: this young prince had almost the whole honour of the day. Some historians attribute the defeat of the French to a few small pieces of cannon, which the English had in their army: it had been upwards of ten or twelve years since the use of artillery was first introduced.

It has been said, that this invention of the Chinese was brought into Europe by the Arabians, who traded in the Indian seas. But this account is by no means probable. Berthold Schwartz, a Benedictine monk was the person who discovered the fatal secret. There were others long before this time that came very near it. Roger Bacon, who was likewise a monk, had many years before taken notice of the great explosions produced by saltpetre. But how comes it that the king of France had not cannon in his army, as well as the king of England? And if the English had this advantage, what is the reason that the French historians impute the loss of this battle to the Genoese cross-bowmen, whom Philip had in his pay? The rain is said to have wetted their bow strings: but why had not the rain the same effect on the English? It would have been better perhaps if those historians had observed, that a king of France, who took Genoese archers into his pay, instead of disciplining his own subjects, and who had no artillery when his enemy had, did not deserve to be victorious.

It is very strange, that although this use of gunpowder could not but make an absolute change in the art of war, yet we cannot fix the date of this change. A nation that could procure a good train of artillery, was sure to be victorious. This of all arts was the most pernicious; and there was the greatest necessity for improving it. Nevertheless, till the reign of Charles

Charles VIII. it continued in its infancy; such is the force of inveterate customs, and so slow is the progress of human industry. They did not make use of artillery in sieges till the reign of Charles V. king of France; and the spear was their principal weapon, till the latter end of the reign of Henry IV.

It is pretended, that at the battle of Crecy the English had only twenty-five thousand horsemen in complete armour, and forty thousand foot; and that the French had forty thousand foot, and very near three thousand horse. They who most diminish the loss on the side of the French, say that it amounted only to twenty thousand men. The count de Blois, who had been one of the pretended causes of the war, was killed in this battle; and the day following the troops of the commons of the kingdom were also defeated. Edward, after two victories obtained within two days, took the town of Calais, of which the English kept possession two hundred and ten years.

It is said that during the siege of this town, Philip of Valois, finding he could not force the besiegers lines, in a fit of rage proposed to king Edward, to decide this great quarrel by a combat of six men on each side. Edward, who was not willing to hazard the certain taking of Calais, on an uncertain combat, refused Philip's challenge, as the latter had before done his. We never see princes terminating their differences between themselves, the blood of their subjects has always flowed on these occasions.

The most memorable thing that happened in this siege, is the right which king Edward reserved to himself by the capitulation, to hang up any six of the principal citizens, and for which there appears to be no reason, as the citizens of Calais were no rebels; but in fact they had good reason to suppose, that if Edward really wanted to put an halter about their necks, it was not to put them to death by it, for he treated them with great humanity, and made a present to each of six gold crowns, known by the name of rose nobles. If it had been his intention to

hang any one, he had perhaps a right to revenge himself in this manner on Geoffry de Charni, who after the surrender of the town, endeavoured to corrupt the English governor by an offer of twenty thousand crowns, and who was taken as he was coming out of the gates with a knight named Eustace de Ribau-
mont. This Ribau-
mont, in the fight, had struck king Edward to the ground. The same day that monarch entertained both of them at his own table, and presented Ribau-
mont with a coronet of pearls, which he himself placed on his head. It is therefore ridiculous to suppose that he had ever an intention to hang six citizens, who had fought courageously in the defence of their country.

This war, which was carried on at the same time in Guienne, Britany, Normandy and Picardy, exhausted France and England of men and money. And yet this was not a fit time to destroy mankind for the purposes of ambition: they should rather have united against a scourge of another kind. A deadly pestilence, which
1347 had made the circuit of the world, and depopulated
and Asia and Africa, was lately come to ravage Europe, and
1348 especially France and England.

This pestilence is said to have carried off a fourth part of the human species. It was one of those causes that have prevented mankind from multiplying in this part of the world, in the proportion one would naturally expect.

We are told by Mezeray and many other writers, that this pestilence came from China, and that an exhalation issued out of the earth like a globe of fire, which bursting, spread its infection over our hemisphere. This is giving a fabulous origin to a calamity which was but too certain. In the first place, it does not appear that a meteor of that sort has ever produced the plague. Secondly, the Chinese annals make no mention of any contagious distemper till towards the year 1504. The plague, properly so called, is a disease peculiar to the climate of Africa, as the small-pox is to Arabia, and the poison that infects the source of
life

life is to the Caribbee Islands. Every climate has its particular poison in this wretched globe, where Nature has mixed a little good with much evil. This pestilence of the fourteenth century was like those which depopulated the earth under Justinian, and at the time of Hippocrates. It was while this scourge was raging with the greatest violence, that Edward and Philip strove to reign over subjects who were dying.

After such a long series of calamities, after the elements and human passions have thus conspired to desolate the earth, it is surprising that Europe should be still in so flourishing a condition. The only resource of the human species was in a few towns, which were despised by the great sovereigns. Commerce and industry has insensibly repaired the mischief done by those princes. England, under Edward III. was richly indemnified for the treasure expended by her monarch in his military expeditions: she sold her wool, and Bruges worked it up. The Flemings employed themselves in manufactures; the Hanse towns formed a republic useful to mankind; and the arts were supported in the free trading cities of Italy. These arts want only to shoot up to maturity: as soon as the great storms blow over, they are transplanted, as it were, of themselves, to the ravaged provinces that stand in need of their assistance.

Under these circumstances died Philip of Valois; a prince who was far from carrying to his tomb the title of *Fortunate*. Yet he had united Dauphiny to the crown of France a little before his death. The last prince of this country having lost his children, and being tired of the wars which he had waged against Savoy, gave the province of Dauphiny to the king of France in 1349, and put on the Dominican habit at Paris.

This province was called Dauphiny, because one of its sovereigns had quartered a dauphin in his arms. It constituted part of the kingdom of Arles, a domain of the empire. The king of France, by this acquisition, became a feudatory to the emperor Charles IV. It is certain that the emperors asserted their rights to this province till the reign of Maximilian I. and the German civilians pretend it ought to be still a dependance

of the empire. The sovereigns think otherwise. Nothing is more ridiculous than these researches : they might as well pretend to assert the rights of the German emperors to Egypt, because it had been subject to Augustus.

Philip of Valois made a further addition of Roussillon and Sardinia to his dominions, by lending money to the king of Majorca, of the house of Arragon, who gave him these provinces as a security ; provinces which Charles VIII. afterwards restored, without being reimbursed. He likewise acquired Montpellier, which the crown has preserved ever since. It is surprising, that during so unfortunate a reign, he was able to purchase these provinces, and likewise to pay a great sum for Dauphiny. The duty upon salt, which was called the *Salic law*, the raising of the land-tax, and the debasing of the coin, enabled him to make these purchases. The state was enlarged, but impoverished ; and though this prince had once the name of *Fortunate*, his people could never pretend to this title. Yet in the reign of his son John they had reason to regret even the time of Philip of Valois.

But the event most interesting to the people, during this reign, was the appeal to a general council, which the parliament introduced gradually, by the care of Peter Cugnieres the solicitor-general. The clergy made loud complaints against this usage, but the king was pleased to connive at it, and not to oppose a remedy by which his authority and the laws of the states were supported. This appeal to a general council, thrown in by the parliaments of the kingdom, is used as a complaint against unjust or undue sentences pronounced by the ecclesiastical courts, as a denunciation of encroachments on the regal jurisdiction, and as an opposition to those papal bulls which may be contrary to the rights and privileges of the king and his subjects.

This remedy, or rather palliative, was only a faint imitation of the famous statute of *Premunire*, made in the reign of Edward III. by the English parliament ; a law which ordains that whosoever sues another in the spiritual court, for any thing that may be determined by

by the temporal magistrate, shall be imprisoned. The English, in all that relates to the liberties of the people, have more than once shewn the way to other nations.

C H A P. LXXVI.

Of France under King John.—Celebrated Meeting of the States General.—Battle of Poitiers.—King John taken Prisoner.—Misfortunes of France.—State of Chivalry.

THE reign of king John was still more unfortunate than that of Philip. John, who was surnamed the Good, began his reign with ordering the count d'Eu, constable of France, to be assassinated. And soon afterwards his cousin and son-in-law, the king of Navarre, caused the new constable Don la Cerda, a prince of the house of Spain, to be murdered. This king of Navarre, Charles, grand-son of Louis X. king of Navarre in right of his mother, and prince of the blood by his father's side, was one of the scourges of France as well as king John, and well merited the title of *Charles the Bad*.

The king having been obliged to pardon him in full parliament, arrested him afterwards for crimes of an inferior kind, and without any form of trial caused four lords of his party to be beheaded. Such cruel executions were the consequence of a weak government. This was productive of cabals, which were attended with severe punishments, and these with repentance.

John began his reign with reviving the base coin which had been current in his father's time, and threatened to put the officers to death, who were intrusted with the secret. This abuse was the effect, and at the same time a proof of most calamitous times. These misfortunes and abuses were at length productive of laws. France for some time had the same form of government

government as England. The kings summoned the states-general, who were substituted to the ancient parliaments of the nation. These states were like the English parliament, composed of the nobility, the bishops, and deputies of the towns; and what was called the new parliament, fixed at Paris, was very near the same thing as the court of king's-bench at London. The chancellor was the second officer of the crown in both kingdoms; in England he was the speaker of the house of lords, and had a jurisdiction over the king's-bench. In France the chancellor's authority was the same; and what evidently demonstrates that the same principles of government were established both at Paris and in London, was, that the states-general, in 1355, made John king of France sign almost the same regulations, and the same charter as had been signed by John king of England. The nature of the subsidies, their duration, and the value of money, were all settled by that assembly. The king engaged never to compel his subjects to furnish his household with provisions, not to make use of their carriages or beds without paying for them, nor to alter the coin, &c.

The states-general of 1355, the most memorable that ever were held, are those of which our historians say the least. Father Daniel only tells us that they were held in the hall of the new parliament. He ought to have added, that the parliament was not perpetual at that time, and had no seat in this great assembly. In fact, the provost of the merchants of Paris, as the natural deputy of the first city in the kingdom, spoke in the name of the third estate. But a very essential point of history, upon which they have been intirely silent, is, that those states laid a subsidy of about a hundred and ninety marks of silver, to pay thirty thousand *gend'armes*, or armed troops; that is, nine millions five hundred thousand livres of our present French currency. Those thirty thousand *gend'armes*, with their followers, composed at least an army of fourscore thousand men, which was to be joined by the commons

commons of the kingdom ; and when the year expired, they were to raise a new subsidy for the support of the same army. It is right however to observe, that this kind of great charter was only a transient regulation, whereas that of England proved a lasting fundamental law.

But at length the Black Prince, with a small but formidable army, advanced towards Poitiers, and ravaged all that country which had formerly belonged to his ancestors. King John marched against him with an army of very near sixty thousand men. It is well known that if the French king had declined coming to an engagement, he might have starved the whole English army.

If the Black Prince was guilty of an error in venturing too far, king John committed a much greater one in attacking him. This battle of Maupertuis or Poitiers, 1356 very much resembled that in which Philip of Valois was defeated. There was great order in the Black Prince's little army; the French were only brave, but the valour of the English, and of the Gascons, who served under the prince of Wales, carried the day. There is no mention of any cannon in either of the armies. This silence of historians gives us room to doubt whether there was any at Crecy; or it shews, that having had little or no effect at that battle, it was discontinued; or it proves how tenacious mankind are of ancient usages, so as even to neglect new advantages; or, in short, it demonstrates the neglect of cotemporary historians. The chief of the nobility of France were slain, and this proves that the armour was neither so weighty nor compleat as formerly; the rest ran away. The king being wounded in the face was taken prisoner with one of his sons. It is a circumstance worthy of notice, that this monarch surrendered to one of his subjects, whom he had banished, and who was now in the enemy's service. The same thing happened afterwards to Francis I. The Black Prince conducted both his prisoners to Bourdeaux, from whence they were conveyed to London. It is well known with what politeness

politeness and respect he treated the captive king; a moderation which added new lustre to his glory. He made his entry into London upon a little black horse, and rode on the left hand of his prisoner, who was mounted on a steed remarkable for his beauty and fine trappings.

The king's confinement produced a civil war in the city of Paris; every ambitious person thinking then to form a party. Factions were established under a pretence of reformation. Charles, dauphin of France, who was afterwards the wise king Charles V. was declared regent, only as it were to see almost the whole kingdom revolt against him.

Paris at that time began to be a formidable city; it contained fifty thousand men able to bear arms. It was then they invented the use of chains in the streets, which served as a barrier against the seditious. Charles the dauphin was obliged to recal the king of Navarre, whom the king his father had sent to prison; and this indeed was letting his enemy loose against himself. The king of Navarre came to Paris to blow the coals of sedition. Marcel, the provost of the merchants of Paris, entered the Louvre, followed by the malecontents, and caused Robert of Clermont, marshal of France, together with the marshal of Champagne, to be massacred in the presence of the dauphin. In the mean time the peasants assembled in a tumultuous manner from all parts, and in the general confusion attacked every gentleman they met with, behaving towards him with the same licentious fury as rebel-slaves behave towards rigid masters, whom they have been so fortunate as to overpower. They consoled themselves for their mean condition and misery by a thousand acts of barbarity, and carried their fury so far as to roast a nobleman in his castle, and to compel his wife and his daughters to eat the flesh.

In the midst of these convulsions, Charles of Navarre aspired to the crown; and the dauphin and he waged war against each other, which ended only in a dissembled peace. France was thus rent in pieces for the

the space of four years after the battle of Poitiers. How happened it that Edward and the prince of Wales did not take advantage of their victory, and of the misfortunes of the conquered? It would seem as if the English were afraid of the grandeur of their prince, and therefore were slow in their supplies: hence Edward was treating about the ransom of his prisoner, while the Black Prince was concluding a truce.

I am of opinion that there were faults committed on all sides. But it is hard to conceive how all our historians should have the simplicity to affirm, that king Edward III. going to reap the benefit of the two victories of Crecy and Poitiers, and advancing within a few leagues ¹³⁶⁰ of Paris, was suddenly seized with a sacred horror, in consequence of a great fall of rain; upon which he flung himself upon his knees, and made a vow to the Virgin Mary that he would grant a peace. It has seldom happened that a fall of rain has decided the will of conquerors or the fate of kingdoms; and if Edward III. made such a vow to the Virgin Mary, it was certainly a very good vow to him. He demanded for the king's ransom, Poitou, Saintonge, Agenois, Perigord, Limousin, Quercy, Angoumois, Rouvergue, and all that he had possessed himself of in the neighbourhood of Calais, the whole in sovereignty, without homage. I am surprized he did not likewise require Normandy and Anjou, his ancient patrimony. He demanded at the same time three millions of crowns.

By this treaty Edward ceded to John the title of king of France, and his rights to Normandy, Touraine, and Anjou. It is true, that the ancient demesnes which the English kings possessed in France, were much more considerable than what were yielded to them by this peace; yet even this was a fourth part of the kingdom. At length John was released after four years confinement, upon delivering up his brother, and two of his sons, as hostages. One of the greatest difficulties was to pay the ransom; for it was stipulated that he should remit six hundred thousand crowns for the first payment. France was then exhausted, and could not

furnish the money; so that they were obliged to recal the Jews, and to sell them the privilege of living and trading in the country. The king himself was obliged to pay for the necessaries of his household, in leather money, in the middle of which there was a little nail of silver. His poverty and misfortunes deprived him of all authority, and the kingdom of all sort of good government.

The soldiers who had been disbanded, and the peasants who had learnt something of the art of war, formed themselves into parties in the different provinces, but especially beyond the Loire. One of their leaders stiled himself the *friend* of God, and the enemy of all the world. One John of Gouge, a burgher of Sens, was declared king by these banditti, and did almost as much mischief by his depredations, as the lawful king had done by his unfortunate enterprizes. At length, what is most surprizing, the king in the midst of this general desolation went to Avignon, where the popes then resided, to revive the ancient projects of the crusades.

A king of Cyprus was come to solicit this expedition against the Turks, who had already spread themselves over a part of Europe. Probably king John thought only of quitting his native country; but instead of going to make this chimerical expedition against the Turks, finding himself unable to discharge the remainder of his ransom to the English, he returned to London to surrender himself up as hostage in the place of his brother and his children. There he died, and
 1363 his ransom was never paid. To complete his humiliation, it has been said that the motive of his return to England, was to see a woman, whom he fell in love with at the age of fifty-six.

Britany, which had been the cause of this war, was abandoned to its fate. The count of Blois, and the count of Montfort, disputed this province; Montfort having escaped from his confinement at Paris, and Blois
 1364 from his at London, decided the quarrel near Avray in a pitched

a pitched battle. The English still prevailed; and the count of Blois was slain.

This age of barbarousness, sedition, rapine, and murder, was nevertheless the most brilliant period of chivalry. It served as a counterpoise to the general ferocity of manners. We shall treat of it separately in another place. Its principles were honour and generosity, joined with gallantry. The most celebrated achievement in chivalry is the combat of thirty Bretons against twenty English, six Bretons, and four Germans, at the time when the countess of Blois in her husband's name, and Montfort's widow in her son's name, were waging war against each other in Britany in 1351. The motive of the combat was a point of honour; for it had been resolved upon at a conference held for settling a peace. Instead of negotiating, they challenged: and Beaumanoir, who was at the head of the Bretons for the countess of Blois, said they should fight to see *who had the handsomest mistress*. They fought in an inclosed ground. Of the sixty combatants there were only five knights killed, one on the side of the Bretons, and four English.

All these achievements of chivalry availed nothing; and especially were no remedy against the want of discipline in the troops, and of order in the civil administration. If the Paulus Emilius's and the Scipio's had fought thus in an inclosed ground to decide which had the fairest mistress, the Romans would never have been the conquerors and legislators of the world.

Edward, after his victories and conquests, devoted himself almost wholly to tournaments. Enamoured of a woman unworthy of his affection, he sacrificed to her his interest and his glory, and at length lost the fruits of his achievements in France. He passed away his time in diversions and tournaments, and in the ceremonies of his order of the garter.

The famous round table set up by him at Windsor, to which all the knights in Europe were invited, gave the first rise to all the fabulous stories of the knights of the round table, which romance writers fictitiously

attribute to king Arthur. At length Edward III. after having out-lived his fame and good fortune, died in the arms of his mistress Alice Pierce, who, while she was closing his eyes, stole the jewels he wore about him, and even the ring from off his finger. It is difficult to say which died in the most miserable manner, the conqueror or the conquered.

After the death of John king of France, Charles V. his son, justly surnamed the Wise, repaired the ruins of his country by patience and negotiations. We shall see how he expelled the English from almost every part of France. But while he was making preparations for this great enterprize, the Black Prince, about the year 1366, added new glory to that which he had acquired at Crecy and Poitiers. Never did the English perform actions so memorable and at the same time so useless.

C H A P. LXXVII.

Of the Black Prince.—Of Don Pedro the Cruel, King of Castile; and of the Constable du Guesclin.

THE situation of Castile was almost as unfortunate as that of France: Peter, or Don Pedro, surnamed the Cruel, who sat upon that throne, is represented to us a tiger, who thirsted after human blood, and felt a joy in spilling it. There are but few instances of such a character in nature. Sanguinary men are only such in the transports of revenge, or in the exertion of that horrid policy which looks upon cruelty as a necessary measure; but no man ever spills blood merely for pleasure.

Don Pedro ascended the throne when he was yet a minor, and in very unfavourable circumstances. His father Alphonso IX. had had seven bastards by his mistress Eleanor of Gusman: these bastards had such considerable settlements, that they defied the royal authority; and their mother, who had still more power than

than they, insulted the queen-dowager. Castile was thus divided between two parties, one who held with the queen-mother, and the other with Eleanor. The king had no sooner attained the age of one-and-twenty, than he found himself obliged to maintain a civil war against the faction of the bastards: he fought, and was victorious, and put Eleanor to death to satisfy his mother's revenge. So far he may be said to have been brave but too severe. He then espoused Blanche of Bourbon; and the first news he heard concerning his wife, upon her arrival at Valladolid, was, that she was fallen in love with the grand master of St. Jago, one of those very bastards who had waged war against him. I am not ignorant that intrigues of this nature are seldom proved, and that a prudent prince in such a case ought rather to pretend ignorance, than to seek for revenge: but after all the king was excusable, since there is still a family in Spain, which boasts of being descended from this adulterous commerce, and this is the family of Henriquez.

Blanche of Bourbon was at least so imprudent as to enter into too close a connection with the faction of the bastards, her husband's enemies. Can we then be surprised, that the king left her in a castle, and consoled himself with other amours?

Don Pedro was therefore obliged to fight at the same time against the king of Arragon, and against his rebellious brothers: but victory still followed him; and indeed he made a cruel use of it. He seldom relented; so that his relations who had appeared in arms against him, were sacrificed to his resentment: in short, this grand master of St. Jago was put to death by his order. It was from this circumstance that he derived the surname of *Cruel*; whereas John king of France who had assassinated the constable of France, and four Norman lords, was called John *the Good*.

During these troubles the wife of Don Pedro died; and as she had been guilty of crimes, it was of course said that she died by poison. But once more I say it, that

that we ought not to bring this charge without sufficient proof.

It was doubtless the interest of the enemies of Don Pedro, to have it spread all over Europe that his wife died of poison. Henry of Transamare, one of those bastards, who had his brother's and his mother's death to revenge, and likewise his own intestests to maintain, availed himself of this conjuncture. France at that time was infested with those troops of banditti, called *Malandrins*, who did all the mischief which Edward had not been able to commit. Henry of Transamare entered into a treaty with Charles V. king of France, to free the kingdom of those robbers, and to take them into his service. The king of Arragon, constantly an enemy to the Castilian, promised to grant them a passage. Bertrand du Guesclin, a knight of great reputation, who only sought for an occasion to distinguish himself, engaged the *Malandrins* to acknowledge him as their chief, and to follow him to Castile. This enterprise of Bertrand du Guesclin has been considered as an holy action, which he is said to have performed for the good of his soul; a holy action, which consisted in leading a gang of banditti, to assist a rebel against a cruel but legitimate king.

It is well known that du Guesclin, when passing by Avignon, happening to be in want of money to pay his troops, demanded a considerable sum of the pope and his court, and obliged them to pay it. This indeed was a necessary extortion; but I dare not mention the name they would have given it, if it had not been made at the head of a body of men which might pass for an army.

- 1366 The bastard Henry assisted by these troops which had increased in their march, and likewise supported by Arragon, began with causing himself to be proclaimed king in the town of Burgos. Don Pedro thus attacked by the French, had recourse to the Black Prince their conqueror. This prince, who was sovereign of Guienne, which his father had bestowed on him as a reward for his heroic exploits, and who consequently must

must have beheld with a jealous eye the success of the French arms in Spain, through interest and honour espoused the justest side. He marched into Spain with his Gascons, and some English; and soon afterwards on the banks of the Ebro near the village of Navarette, was fought the bloody battle of that name between Don Pedro and the Black Prince on the one side, and Henry of Transtamare and du Guesclin on the other. The Black Prince here acquired more glory than at Crecy and Poitiers, because the battle was longer disputed. His victory was complete; for he took Bertrand du Guesclin, and the marshal of Andrehen, prisoners, who would surrender to none but him. Henry of Transtamare was obliged to fly to Arragon, and the Black Prince re-established Don Pedro on the throne. Don Pedro treated several of the rebels with a severity which the laws of all governments authorize by the name of justice: in short, he used the unhappy right of revenging himself in its full extent. The Black Prince who had the glory of restoring him to his crown, had likewise the additional glory of putting a stop to his cruelties; and indeed he is next to Alfred the hero, whom the English hold most in veneration. 1368

As soon as the prince who supported Don Pedro had retired, and Bertrand du Guesclin had paid his ransom, the bastard of Transtamare revived the party of the malecontents, and Bertrand du Guesclin, who was secretly employed by king Charles V. began to raise new troops.

On the side of Transtamare were Arragon, the rebels of Castile, and the French succours: Don Pedro had not only the best part of the Castilians with him, but also Portugal, and the Moors of Spain: but these new allies rendered him more odious, without being of much service to him. Transtamare and du Guesclin having no longer the genius and fortune of the Black Prince to contend with, at length gained a complete victory in the neighbourhood of Toledo. Don Pedro retired after his defeat to a castle, which they laid siege to; and endeavouring to make his escape, he was taken 1368

taken prisoner by a French gentleman, named le Begue de Vilaines. Upon being led to this knight's tent, the first object he saw, was the count of Transtamare; when transported with rage, he flew, though disarmed at his brother, who with a poniard immediately put an end to his life.

Thus perished Don Pedro at the age of thirty-four, and with him ended the race of Castile. His enemy, his brother, his assassin came to the crown, without any other right than that of murder, and from him descended the kings of Castile, who reigned in Spain, till Joan transferred this sceptre to the house of Austria, by marrying Philip the Fair, father of Charles V.

C H A P. LXXVIII.

Of France and England during the Reign of Charles V.—That Prince strips the English of their Conquests.—Of his Government.—Richard II. King of England, de throne.

THE policy of Charles V. preserved France from ruin; and the necessity of weakening the conquerors, Edward III. and the Black Prince, seemed to justify his proceedings. He took advantage of the father's old age, and of the sickly state of the son, who was attacked with a dropfy, of which he died in 1376. He soon found out a way to sow division between the sovereign prince of Guienne and his vassals; to elude treaties; to refuse to pay the remainder of his father's ransom upon plausible pretences; to ingratiate himself with the new king of Castile, and even with that king of Navarre, Charles, surnamed the Bad, who had so large an estate in France; to stir up the new king of Scotland, Robert Stuart against the English; to restore order in the finances; to make the people contribute to the public expence without murmuring; in short to have as much success without stirring out of his cabinet,

net, as king Edward had had after crossing the sea and gaining so many victories.

The moment he saw all his engines ready, he took one of those bold steps, which might pass for temerity in politics, were they not justified by the prudence of his measures, and the prosperity of the event. He sent ¹³⁶⁹ a knight and a judge of Toulouse to summon the Black Prince to appear before him in the court of peers, in order to account for his conduct. This was behaving ¹³⁷⁰ as lord paramount to the conqueror of his father and grandfather, who was possessed of Guienne, and the neighbouring parts in full sovereignty by right of conquest, as well as by solemn treaty. He was not only cited as a subject, but an arret of parliament was likewise issued out, by which Guienne was confiscated, together with every thing in France belonging to the house of England. It was the custom to send a herald to declare war; but this ceremony was now performed by a page, whom they sent to London: a proof that Edward was no longer formidable.

The valour and abilities of Bertrand du Guesclin, now become constable of France, and more especially the good order established by Charles V. in every part of the realm, tended in some measure to dignify the irregularity of these proceedings, and shewed that in public affairs utility is constantly productive of glory.

The Black Prince being in a dying state, was no longer able to take the field; and, besides, his father sent him but weak supplies: hence the English, who had been victorious before that time in every battle, where now beaten on all sides. Bertrand du Guesclin, without obtaining such signal victories as those of Crecy and Compiègne, made exactly such a campaign as that by which in these latter times viscount Turenne gained the character of the greatest general in Europe. He fell upon the English quarters in Maine and Anjou, ¹³⁷⁰ defeated all the parties one after the other, and with his own hand took their general Grandson prisoner. He reduced Poitou and Saintonge, under the obedience of France. The towns all surrendered, some by force,

others by intrigue. The elements likewise fought for Charles V. The English had equipped a formidable fleet, which was kept back by contrary winds. Truces had been artfully negotiated, and every thing seemed to promise new success.

- 1378 Charles, who twenty years before was not master of money sufficient to maintain a guard for his person, had now five armies and a fleet. His ships of war insulted the English on their own coast, where they landed some troops and committed great outrages, which after the death of Edward III. England took no care to revenge. That crown had nothing left but the cities of Bourdeaux and Calais, with a few fortresses.

- Then it was that France lost Bertrand du Guesclin. It is well known what honour the king rendered to his memory. He was the first, I believe, that had a funeral oration pronounced in his praise, and likewise the first who was interred in the church designed for the burying-place of the kings of France. His body was carried with the same ceremony as if he had been a sovereign. Four princes of the blood followed the bier. His horses, pursuant to the custom of the times, were presented in church to the bishop who officiated on the occasion, and gave them his blessing with imposition of hands. These particulars are of no importance in themselves; but they show the spirit of chivalry. The regard paid to knights celebrated for their military achievements, extended even to their horses which had fought under them. Charles soon followed du Guesclin; he was said to have died by a slow poison, which had been given him above ten years before, and finally wasted him at the age of forty-four; as if there were any aliments in nature that could deprive people of life at the expiration of a certain time. It is true, that a poison which has not been strong enough to produce instant death, will leave a languishment in the body, the same as every violent disease; but it is by no means true, that it will produce those slow effects which the

vulgar

vulgar think inevitable. The real poison which killed Charles V. was a bad constitution.

It is well known that the majority of the kings of France was fixed by this prince at the age of fourteen; and that this wise ordinance, though ineffectual in regard to the preventing of disturbances, was registered at a bed of justice in 1374. He was desirous of abolishing the ancient abuse of private wars between the great lords, an abuse which was looked upon as a law of the state. These wars were prohibited under his reign, when he came to be master: he even forbid the wearing of arms; but this was one of those laws, the execution of which was at that time impossible.

We are told that the treasures he amassed amounted to seventeen millions of livres. It is certain, that he had accumulated money, and that the whole fruit of his oeconomy was lost and squandered away by his brother the duke of Anjou, in his unfortunate expedition to Naples, of which we have already spoken.

After the death of Edward III. the conqueror of France, and of Charles V. its restorer, it evidently appeared that the superiority of a nation depends intirely on those who have the conducting of it.

Richard II. son of the Black Prince, succeeded his grandfather Edward III. when he was only eleven years of age; and some time after Charles VI. ascended the throne of France at the age of twelve. These two minorities did not prove happy; but England had the first reason to complain.

In a former chapter we observed with what fury and madness the peasants of France were possessed in the reign of king John, and how they revenged their grievances and misfortunes upon all the gentlemen they could find, and who indeed were their oppressors. The same frenzy seized the English. It seemed as if such another war was going to break out, as that which the Romans were heretofore obliged to wage against their slaves. A tiler and a priest did as much mischief in England, as the quarrels between the king and parliament are ever capable of producing. They assembled

bled the people of three counties, and easily persuaded them, that the rich had long enough enjoyed the goods of the earth, and that it was now time for the poor to take their revenge. They led them directly to London, plundered part of the city, and caused the archbishop of Canterbury and the high treasurer to be beheaded. It is true this madness ended with the death of the chiefs, and the dispersion of the revolted: but such scenes of tumult which were not uncommon in Europe, sufficiently prove the wretched state of the different governments at that time. They were far from having attained the real end of politics, which consists in uniting the several orders of the state for the public good.

It may be said, that the English at that time did not better understand the prerogatives of their kings, nor the privileges of their parliaments. Richard II. at the age of eighteen, wanted to be despotic; and the English to be too free; this soon gave rise to a civil war. In most countries, civil broils prove fatal to conspirators; but in England they are fatal to kings. Richard, after struggling ten years with his subjects about his authority, was at length deserted by his own party. His cousin, the duke of Lancaster, grandson of Edward III. who had been for some time in exile, returned to England with three ships only. He had no need of a greater force: the whole nation declared in his favour. Richard II. demanded only that they would spare his life, and grant him a pension for his subsistence.

Richard was tried by the parliament in the same manner as Edward II. had been. The charges brought in form against him have been preserved: among other things, he was accused of having borrowed money without repaying it; of having kept spies, and having said that he was master of the estates of his subjects. He was condemned as an enemy to the liberties of mankind and a traitor; and confined to the Tower, where he resigned to the duke of Lancaster the ensigns of 1399 royalty, by a writing signed with his own hand, in which

which he acknowledged himself unfit to reign. He was so indeed, since he could be mean enough to make such a confession.

Thus the same century beheld the solemn deposition of two kings of England, Edward II. and Richard II. and likewise of the emperor Wenceslaus and pope John XXIII. all four tried and condemned with the forms of justice.

The English parliament having imprisoned their king, declared, that in case of any attempt to restore him, he should be judged worthy of death. Upon the first rising in his favour, eight ruffians went and assassinated the king in prison. Richard defended his life better than he had done his throne; he snatched the battle-ax from one of his murderers, and killed four of them before he was overpowered. The duke of Lancaster ascended the throne by the name of Henry IV. during his reign England was neither quiet nor in a capacity to undertake any thing against France; but his son Henry V. brought about the greatest revolution that had happened since the reign of Charlemagne.

C H A P. LXXIX.

Of Charles VI. King of France, and the Invasion of that Kingdom by Henry V. King of England.

THE care which king Charles V. had taken to retrieve the losses of France, was in some measure the very means of accelerating its ruin. The treasures which he had amassed, were squandered away; and the heavy taxes which had been raised in his reign, alienated the affections of the nation. We are told, that this prince spent for his whole family fifteen hundred gold marks a year. His brothers, at the time they were regents of the kingdom, spent seven thousand for Charles VI. then but thirteen years of age, and who, notwithstanding

standing this great profusion, wanted necessaries. Such details as these should not be despised; they are the secret cause of the ruin of states, as well as of families.

Louis of Anjou, the same who was adopted by Joan I. queen of Naples, one of the uncles of Charles VI. not satisfied with embezzling his pupil's treasure, laid the most heavy exactions upon the people. Paris, Rouen, and most of the towns rose up in arms; and the same madness which afterwards depopulated Paris in the minority of Louis XIV. seemed to rage under Charles VI. The private and public executions on this occasion were as cruel, as the insurrection had been outrageous. The great schism of the papal see, of which we have already taken notice, added to the disorder. The popes of Avignon who were acknowledged in France, fleeced the kingdom by every stratagem that avarice under the cloak of religion can invent. The people still flattered themselves, that when the king came of age, he would redress these grievances by a better administration.

1384 He had in person revenged the cause of his vassal, the earl of Flanders, upon the rebel Flemings, who were always supported by England. He had taken advantage of the troubles, into which that island was plunged under Richard II. A fleet of above twelve hundred sail was fitted out, to make a descent upon the English coast. This number ought not to appear incredible; St. Louis had more. This fleet consisted indeed only of transport vessels; yet the expedition with which it was equipped, is a proof that in those days there was more timber fit for shipping than there is at present, and that the people were not void of industry. The jealousy which the king's uncles had of each other, hindered the fleet from being employed. It only served to shew what resources France might have under a good government, since notwithstanding the immense treasure the duke of Anjou had expended in his unfortunate expedition to Naples, it was still capable of such great enterprizes.

The

The nation at length seemed to have some respite; when the king, at the very time he was setting out for Britany to chastise the duke, of whom he had reason to complain, was seized with a terrible frenzy. This disorder began with a drowsiness, which was followed by a loss of his understanding, and at length terminated in a fit of madness. When he was first attacked with this complaint, he killed four men, and continued striking every person about him, till exhausted by these convulsive motions, he fell into a profound lethargy.

I am not surprized that all France thought him poisoned and bewitched. There have been instances even in the present age, enlightened as it is, of popular prejudices altogether as unjust. His brother, the duke of Orleans, had married Valentina of Milan; and this lady was charged with being the cause of the king's misfortune: which proves only that the French were very ignorant in those days, and imagined the Italians to be more knowing than themselves.

This suspicion was some time afterwards increased by an adventure worthy of the rudeness of those times. There was a masquerade at court, at which the king appeared in the disguise of a satyr, dragging four other satyrs in chains. They were all dressed in linen daubed over with rosin, to which they had fastened some coarse flax and hemp. The duke of Orleans had the ill luck of running a flambeau against one of those habits, which took fire in an instant. The four lords were burnt, and with difficulty was the king's life preserved by the presence of mind of his aunt, the duchess of Berry, who wrapped him in her gown. This accident caused a return of one of his fits; perhaps he might have been cured by bleeding, bathing, and a proper regimen; but they sent for a forcerer to Montpellier. The forcerer came; and the king was a little better, which they did not fail to attribute to the power of magic. But he soon relapsed again, and the disease, by its frequent returns, was soon increased to that degree as to become incurable. To complete the misery of France,
the

the king had now and then some lucid intervals, without which they might have provided for the government of the kingdom: thus the little share of reason he enjoyed, proved more fatal to his subjects than his fits: the states were never called, nor was there any regulation made for the public administration. The king remained king, intrusting his feeble authority and the care of his person sometimes to his brother, and at other times to his uncles, the dukes of Burgundy and Berry. It was an additional misfortune to the state, that the appanages of those princes were very considerable. Paris necessarily became a scene of civil war, which was sometimes confined to secret underminings, and sometimes broke out into open hostilities. Every part of the city, even the university, was in a state of faction, and interfered in matters of government.

1407 It is well known that John duke of Burgundy caused his cousin the duke of Orleans to be assassinated in the *rue barbette*; and the king had neither understanding nor power enough to bring the guilty to justice. The duke of Burgundy condescended however to take out
1408 letters of grace, and came to court to triumph in his crime. Here he assembled all the princes and grandees, and in the presence of them all, doctor John Petit not only justified the murder of the duke of Orleans, but likewise established the doctrine of homicide, on the example of the various murders which are mentioned in the historical books of scripture. He presumed to lay down as a doctrine, what is mentioned in those books only as an historical event, instead of informing mankind, as he ought to have done, that an assassination mentioned in scripture, is as detestable as if it had been in the history of the most barbarous savages, or of the times of which we are speaking. This doctrine was condemned, as we have seen, by the council of Constance, and yet has been since revived.

1409 It was about this very time that the marshal of Boucicaut lost the city of Genoa, which had put herself under the protection of France. The French were
masacred

massacred there as in Sicily. The flower of the French nobility, who went to signalize themselves in Hungary against Bajazet the Turkish emperor, were slain in the¹⁴¹⁰ unfortunate battle in which the Christians were defeated. But these foreign calamities were nothing in comparison to those of the state.

The king's wife, Isabella of Bavaria, had a party in Paris, and so had the duke of Burgundy; the children of the duke of Orleans had likewise one, which was considerable. The king alone had no party. But what shews the importance of Paris, and that it was considered as the *primum mobile* of the kingdom, the duke of Burgundy, who beside the duchy from which he took his title, was also sovereign of Flanders and Artois, still placed his whole ambition in being master of Paris. The faction of the duke of Burgundy was called the Burgundian, and that of Orleans went by the name of Armagnac, from the count of Armagnac, father-in-law to the duke of Orleans, son of him who was assassinated at Paris. Which ever had the upper hand, took care to hang, to assassinate, or to burn all those of the contrary faction. Nobody could be sure of their lives for a day. They fought in the streets, in the churches, in the houses, and in the fields.

This was a favourable opportunity for England to recover her ancient patrimony in France, as well as that which had been ceded to her by treaties. Henry V. a prince of great prudence and courage, negotiated, and prepared for war at the same time. At length he made a descent upon Normandy with an army of near¹⁴¹⁵ fifty thousand men. After taking Harfleur he advanced into a country wasted by factions; but a contagious dysentery carried off three-fourths of his army. This great invasion, however, reunited all parties against the English; even the duke of Burgundy, though he had already been privately treating with the king of England, sent five hundred men in armour with some cross-bow men, to the assistance of his country. All the nobility mounted on horseback, and the commoners marched under their banners; so that

the constable d'Albret soon found himself at the head of sixty thousand fighting men. What had formerly happened to Edward III. occurred again to Henry V. but the principal resemblance was in the battle of Agincourt, which was exactly like that of Crecy. The English obtained the victory almost as soon as the engagement began. Their great bows, six feet high, which they were very dextrous in bending, decided the contest immediately in their favour. They had neither artillery nor fuses, which is a further reason to think that they had none at the battle of Crecy. Perhaps these bows are a more formidable weapon; I have seen some that would carry much further than fuses; they may likewise be used quicker and longer: and yet they are intirely laid aside. We may further observe, that the French gend'armes fought on foot at Agincourt, Crecy, and Poitiers, who before used to be invincible on horseback. Upon this memorable day there happened a thing most horrible even in war. While the armies were still engaged, some of the militia of Picardy attempted to plunder the English camp; upon which, Henry gave orders to his men to kill all the prisoners they had taken; these were accordingly put to the sword; and after this slaughter the English took fourteen thousand more, whose lives were spared. Seven princes of France were slain this day, together with the constable; five princes were taken prisoners, and upwards of ten thousand French were left on the field of battle.

It would seem that after so complete a victory, the English had nothing more to do than to march up to Paris, and subdue a divided and exhausted kingdom which was only one extensive ruin. But even in this ruinous state it had some strength left. In short, it is a certain fact, that from this battle of Agincourt, which put all France into mourning, and which did not cost the English three men of any note, the conquerors reaped no other fruit than glory. Henry was obliged to return to England in order to raise money and new troops.

The spirit of giddiness, which had seized the French nation as much as their king, did more mischief than the defeat of Agincourt. Two dauphins were now dead, and the third, afterwards Charles VII. and who was only sixteen years old, endeavoured to save the remains of this great wrack. The queen his mother had extorted letters patent from her husband, by which she was intrusted with the reins of state. She was covetous, ambitious, and addicted to gallantry. The treasure of which she had plundered the kingdom and her husband, was deposited in several places, but especially in the churches: the dauphin and the Armagnacs, who had discovered this money, applied it to the pressing wants of the state. To this affront which she received from her son, the king added another of a more sensible nature. One evening as he went to the queen's apartment, he met the lord of Boisbourdon, who was coming out; and he ordered him immediately to be seized. Boisbourdon was put to the torture, confined in a sack, and thrown into the Seine. The queen was directly sent prisoner to Blois, and from thence to Tours, without being suffered to see her husband. It was this accident, and not the battle of Agincourt, that put the crown of France on the king of England's head. The queen applied for assistance to the duke of Burgundy, who gladly embraced this opportunity of establishing his authority on the calamities of the state.

The duke released the queen from her confinement 1418 at Tours, ravaged the country upon his march, and at length concluded an alliance with the king of England. Without this alliance there would have been no revolution. Henry V. at length assembled an army of twenty-five thousand men, and landed a second time in Normandy. From thence he advanced towards Paris, while John duke of Burgundy posted himself at the gates of this city, where a stupid senseless king was left a prey to every sedition. The duke of Burgundy's 1417 faction in one day massacred the constable of Armagnac, the archbishops of Rheims and Tours, five bishops,

the abbot of St. Denis, and forty magistrates. The queen and the duke of Burgundy made a triumphal entry into Paris in the midst of this carnage. The dauphin fled beyond the Loire, and Henry V. made him-
 1418 self master of all Normandy. Not only the party which still held for the king, but likewise the queen, the duke of Burgundy, and the dauphin, were all in treaty at the same time with the king of England, and deceit prevailed equally on every side.

1419 The young dauphin, who was at that time governed by Tanguy du Chastel, at length concerted that unhappy interview with the duke of Burgundy on the bridge of Montereau. Each of them met attended with ten knights; and Tanguy du Chastel slew the duke of Burgundy in the presence of the dauphin: thus the murder of the duke of Orleans was at length revenged by another murder; so much the more detestable, as it was blended with the violation of public faith.

One would be almost tempted to assert that this murder was not premeditated, so ill had they concerted their measures for supporting the consequences of it. Philip the Good, the new duke of Burgundy, who succeeded his father, was of course the dauphin's enemy through duty as well as politics. The affront the dauphin had offered to his mother, rendered her as implacable as a step-mother; while the king of England availing himself of these horrid circumstances, proclaimed every where that God had led him by the hand to punish the iniquity of the French nation. Then it was that Isabella of Bavaria and the new duke Philip concluded a peace at Troyes, more fatal to France than all the preceding wars, whereby Catherine, daughter of Charles VI. was given away in marriage to the king of England, together with France for her dowry.

It was stipulated at the same time, that Henry V. should be acknowledged as king, but that he should only take upon him the title of regent during the remainder of the unhappy life of the king of France, who was grown quite a natural. In fine, by the contract it was determined, that the person styling himself the
 the

the dauphin, should be pursued with the utmost vigour. Isabella of Bavaria conducted her wretched husband and her daughter to Troyes, where the marriage was consummated. Henry, now king of France, made his entrance into Paris without the least hinderance, and reigned without opposition, while king Charles VI. was shut up with his domestics at the Hotel de St. Paul, and queen Isabella already began to repent of her bargain.

Philip duke of Burgundy solemnly demanded justice for the murder of his father, of the two kings at the hotel de St. Paul, where the few remaining grandees were assembled. Nicholas Raulin, attorney-general of Burgundy, and John Larcher a doctor of the university, impeached the dauphin. The first president of the parliament of Paris, and other deputies from that body, assisted at this assembly. Marigny the solicitor-general made a speech against the presumptive heir and defender of the crown, as if it had been the case of a common assassin. The parliament summoned the dauphin to what they called the *marble table*. This was a large table, which in St. Louis's reign served to receive the rents or duties which were paid in the nature of vassals of the castle of the Louvre, and remained afterwards as a mark of jurisdiction. The dauphin was condemned there for non-appearance, and out-lawed.

It was a delicate and difficult question to determine, who could be the dauphin's judge, whether the Salic law could be set aside, and whether as the murder of the duke of Orleans was not punished, they could inflict any punishment on him who slew the murderer? In Spain, long after this, Philip II. was seen to put his own son to death. Cosmo I. grand duke of Florence, killed one of his sons, who had assassinated the other. This fact is very true; the veracity of Varillas upon this occasion has been questioned to no purpose; the president de Thou gives sufficiently to understand, that he was informed of it upon the spot. In our times the Czar Peter put his son to death. Dreadful examples!

but

but in none of those cases was it ever intended to give away the son's inheritance to a stranger.

Here, then we see the Salic law abolished, the lawful heir to the crown disinherited and proscribed, and the son-in-law reigning peaceably, and taking away the inheritance from his brother-in-law, as we have since seen William prince of Orange, a foreigner, dispossessing his wife's father of the crown of England. If this revolution had been as durable as some others, and the successors of Henry V. had supported the edifice which had been raised by their father, and continued in possession of the throne of France, where is the historian who would have thought of disputing the justice of their cause? Mezeray, in this case, would not have said that Henry V. died of the piles, as a punishment for having seated himself on the throne of the French kings. The popes would have sent them bulls upon bulls; they would have been considered as the anointed of the Lord, and the Salic law would have been treated as an idle chimera. How many Benedictines would have presented the descendants of Henry V. with old vouchers against this law! How many witty writers would have turned it into ridicule; and what a number of celebrated preachers would have exalted Henry V. to the skies, as the avenger of innocent blood and the deliverer of France!

The dauphin retired into Anjou, where he appeared no better than an exile. Henry V. king of France and England, returned to London in order to raise new supplies and new troops. It was not the interest of the English, who have a strong passion for liberty, that their king should be master of France. England would then have been in danger of becoming a province to a foreign kingdom: and after exhausting herself to place her king on the French throne, she might have been enslaved by the forces of the very country which she had conquered, and which would be then at the king's command.

Henry, however, soon returned to Paris with more power than ever. He had treasure and armies at his command,

command, and was also in the flower of life; so that from every circumstance it seemed probable, that the crown of France would be transferred for ever to the house of Lancaster. But all these appearances and hopes were blasted by fate; Henry V. was attacked with a fistula, of which he might have recovered in a more enlightened age: his death was owing to the ignorance of the times in which he lived; and he resigned his last breath in the castle of Vincennes at the age of thirty-four. His body was exposed at St. Denis, as is practised with the kings of France, and afterwards carried to Westminster, where it was interred among the kings of England.

Charles VI. to whom they had out of compassion left the empty title of king, soon after ended his wretched days, after having lived thirty years in continual relapses of frenzy. He died the unhappiest of kings, and king of the unhappiest people in Europe.

The duke of Bedford, brother of Henry V. was the only person who assisted at his funeral. There was not one lord present at the ceremony; some of them had been slain at the battle of Agincourt; the rest were prisoners in England; and the duke of Burgundy would not yield the point of precedency to the duke of Bedford. But they were soon obliged to give way to Bedford in every thing, for he was declared regent of France; and Henry VI. son of Henry V. was proclaimed king at Paris and at London, when only nine months old. The city of Paris even sent deputies to London, to take the oath of allegiance to this infant.

C H A P. LXXX.

Of France during the Reign of Charles VII.—Of the Maid of Orleans, and James Cœur.

THIS inundation of the English into France was similar to that which had overflowed England in the

the reign of Louis VIII. only it was more violent and of longer duration. Charles VII. was under the necessity of recovering his kingdom step by step: he had to fight against the regent duke of Bedford, who was become as absolute as Henry V. and against the duke of Burgundy, who was grown one of the most potent princes in Europe, by the re-union of Hainault, Brabant and Holland to his demesnes. Besides, Charles had as much to apprehend from his friends as from his foes: most of them insulted his misfortunes to such a degree, that his constable, the count de Richmont, who was brother to the duke of Britany, caused two of his favourites to be strangled.

We may judge of the deplorable situation to which Charles was reduced, by the necessity he found himself under of making the silver mark pass for ninety livres in the country subject to his obedience, instead of half a livre which it was worth in the time of Charlemagne.

He was soon obliged to have recourse to another much stranger expedient, namely, to a miracle. A gentleman of the frontiers of Lorraine, whose name was Baudricourt, saw a young servant maid at an inn in the town of Vaucouleurs, whom he looked upon as a fit person to act the character of an inspired amazon. This Joan of Arc, whom the vulgar suppose to have been a shepherdess, was in fact an inn-keeper's servant, of a robust make, "That could ride, as Montstrelet" says, without a saddle, and perform other manly "exercises which young girls are not accustomed to do." She was made to pass for a shepherdess of eighteen years of age; and yet it is certain by her own confession, that she was at that time seven-and-twenty. She had courage and understanding sufficient to conduct this delicate enterprize, in which she afterwards shewed herself a heroine. They carried her before the king at Bourges, where she was examined by matrons, who took care to find her a virgin, and by several doctors of the university with some members of the parliament, who without any hesitation declared her

her inspired: whether it be that they were imposed upon themselves, or that they were artful enough to encourage the cheat. However, the vulgar swallowed the bait, and that was sufficient.

The English at that time were besieging Orleans, 1429 Charles's last resource, and were on the point of making themselves masters of it. This amazon in man's dress, directed by able officers, undertook to throw succours into the town. She began with addressing the soldiers in the name of God, and thus inspired them with that enthusiastical courage, peculiar to all men, who fancy they see the Deity defending their cause. She then put herself at their head, delivered Orleans, beat the English, assured Charles that she would see him consecrated at Rheims, and fulfilled her promise sword in hand. She assisted at the coronation, holding the standard with which she had so bravely fought.

These rapid victories, obtained by a girl, together with the appearances of a miracle, and the king's coronation, which conciliated a respect to his person, had very near re-instated the lawful sovereign, and expelled the foreign pretender; when the instrument of all these wonders, Joan of Arc, was wounded and taken in defending Compeigne. Such a man as the Black Prince would have honoured and respected her courage; but the regent Bedford judged it necessary to stigmatize her, in order to revive the drooping courage of the English. She had pretended a miracle, and Bedford pretended to believe she was a witch. My chief aim is always to observe the spirit of the times; it is that which directs the great events of this globe. The university of Paris presented a complaint against Joan of Arc, charging her with heresy and witchcraft: now either the university thought what the regent would have them think; or if they were not of that opinion, they acted in a base dastardly manner. This heroine, who was worthy of the miracle which she had feigned, was tried at Rouen by Cauchon bishop of Beauvais, with five other French bishops, one English bishop, assisted by a Dominican friar, vicar of the inquisition, and by the doc-

tors of the university. She was declared to be, "A
 " superstitious prophetess of the devil, a blasphemer
 " against God and his saints, and one that had many
 " ways erred against the faith of Christ." As such
 she was condemned to perpetual imprisonment, and to
 fast on bread and water. She made a reply to her
 judges, which, I think, is deserving of eternal me-
 mory. Being asked, why she had dared to assist at the
 consecration of Charles with her standard? "Because,
 " said she, it is but just, that the person who shared in
 " the toil, should also partake of the honour."

- 1431 At length being accused of having dressed herself
 once more in men's clothes, which had been left with
 her on purpose to tempt her, the judges who surely had
 no right to try her, since she was a prisoner of war, de-
 clared her a relapsed heretic; and without any more
 ado condemned a person to the flames, who for having
 served her king would have had altars erected to her in
 those heroic times, when mankind were wont to pay
 1431 divine honours to their deliverers. Charles VII. after-
 wards reinstated her memory, which indeed was suffi-
 ciently honoured by her punishment.

Cruelty alone is not sufficient to determine men to
 inflict such punishments, they must be likewise actuated
 by that spirit of fanaticism, which is a mixture of su-
 perstition and ignorance, and has been the evil of al-
 most every age. Some time before the English con-
 demned the duchess of Gloucester to a public penance
 in St. Paul's church, and a lady, a friend of hers, to be
 burnt alive, upon pretence of some incantation which
 they had used in order to shorten the king's life.
 They likewise burnt lord Cobham as an heretic. In
 Britany the same punishment was inflicted on the
 marshal de Retz, accused of sorcery, and of having
 cut his children's throats to make incantations with
 their blood.

Let the inhabitants of an extensive city, where peace,
 pleasure, and the polite arts reign in all their lustre,
 and where reason begins every day to gain ground; let
 them, I say, compare these with former times, and
 complain

complain if they dare. It is necessary to make some such reflection at almost every page of this history.

In those melancholy times, the communication between the provinces was so interrupted, and the people upon the borders were such strangers to one another, that a few years after the death of the Maid of Orleans, a female adventurer in Lorrain dared to assume her name, and boldly to assert she had escaped the punishment, for that they had burnt a phantom in her stead. But what is more surprizing, she was believed. Honours and riches were conferred upon her; and a gentleman of the family of Armoises married her in 1436, thinking himself happy in being joined in wedlock to the real heroine, who though of mean parentage, was at least his equal by her memorable exploits.

In the course of this war, which was rather tedious than decisive, and occasioned so many calamities, there happened another event which saved the kingdom of France. The duke of Burgundy, Philip the Good, deserved this name, by at length forgiving the death of his father, and uniting with the head of his family against a foreign invader. It is true he made the king pay dear for the assassination, by obliging him to yield to him by treaty all the towns on the river Somme, together with Roye, Montdidier, and the county of Boulogne. He was likewise to be exempted from all homage during his life, so that he became a powerful sovereign; but he had the generosity to deliver the duke of Orleans, the son of him who had been assassinated at Paris, from his long confinement in London. He paid his ransom, which is said to have amounted to three hundred thousand crowns; an exaggeration by no means unusual with the writers of those days. This conduct however is a proof of great virtue. There have been always generous souls, even in the most abandoned times. This prince's virtue did not exclude the love of pleasure and the fair sex, which can never be a vice, but when it leads to vicious actions. It is this same Philip, who, in the year 1430, instituted the order of the Golden Fleece in honour of one of his

mistresses. He had fifteen natural sons, who were all persons of merit. His court was the most magnificent in Europe. Antwerp and Bruges carried on an extensive trade, and diffused plenty throughout his dominions. France, in short, was indebted to him for her peace and grandeur, which increased from that time, notwithstanding her adversities; and her wars foreign and domestic.

Charles VII. recovered his kingdom almost in the same manner as Henry IV. conquered it about one hundred and fifty years afterwards. Charles had not indeed that noble courage, that quick and active mind, nor that heroic disposition which distinguished Henry IV. but like him he was often obliged to keep fair with his foes as well as his friends, to fight with small armies, to take towns, some by surprize, and some by money, till at length he entered Paris in the same manner as Henry IV. afterwards made his entrance, by intrigue and by force. They were both declared incapable of wearing the crown, and they both forgave. They were both guilty of the same weakness, that of giving themselves up too much to their amours; for the amours of the prince seldom fail, in a Christian state, to have a certain influence on the affairs of government, though no such consequence results from them in other parts of the world.

It was not till the year 1437, that Charles VII. made his entry into Paris. The citizens, who had signalized themselves by so many massacres, went forth to meet him with all the demonstrations of affection and joy that were in use among a people then uncivilized. Seven young women, personating the seven sins which are called mortal, and a like number of others to personate the divine and cardinal virtues, each carrying a scroll in her hand, received him at St. Denis's gate. He stopped some time there to see the representation of some religious mysteries which were played by strollers mounted upon stools. The inhabitants of this capital were at that time poor and unpolished. It required more than twenty years to reform the state; and it was

not

not till the year 1450 that the English were driven out of France. They preserved nothing but Calais and Guines; and for ever lost all those vast demesnes which their kings had been possessed of by the right of blood, and which they could not secure to their posterity by the three great victories of Cressy, Poitiers, and Agincourt. The divisions among the English contributed as much as Charles VII. to the recovery of France. That same Henry VI. who had worn the two crowns, and who even went over to Paris upon the ceremony of his coronation, was deposed at London by his relations, and after having been again restored, was a second time removed from the throne.

Charles VII. being at length in quiet possession of France, established such order and regularity as had never been seen in that country since the decline of the family of Charlemagne. He kept regular companies of fifteen hundred gend'armes, each of whom was to serve with six horses; so that this troop consisted of nine thousand horsemen. The captain of one hundred men had a thousand seven hundred livres a year, which amounts to about ten thousand livres of our present French currency. Each gend'arme had three hundred and sixty livres per annum, and each of the five hundred men that attended him had four livres per month. He likewise established four thousand five hundred archers, who had that same pay of four livres, that is, about four and twenty of our present coin. Thus in times of peace it cost about six millions of livres, present currency, to maintain the standing forces. Things are greatly changed all over Europe. The establishment of archers shews that muskets were not in frequent use. This instrument of destruction was not generally introduced till the reign of Louis XI.

Besides these troops, who were in constant service, each village maintained a free archer, who was exempted from the king's tax: and it is by this exemption, which otherwise was peculiar to the nobility, that such a number of persons soon claimed the title and arms of gentlemen. The possessors of fiefs were dis-

pensd

pened from attending the ban, which was no longer convoked. Only the *arriere-ban*, which was composed of the petty rear-vassals, were bound to serve upon occasion.

Many are surprized that after such a series of disasters, France should find such great resources, and so much money. But a fruitful country will be always rich, provided the cultivation of it be not neglected. Civil wars shake the state, but do not destroy it. Murder and ransacking are ruinous to some families, but enrich others. Merchants grow more expert in their business, more ingenuity being required to steer clear of danger in such tempestuous times. James Cœur is a striking instance of the truth of this maxim. He had established the greatest trade that had been ever carried on by any private subject in Europe: and since his time Cosmo de Medicis is the only person that has equalled him. James Cœur had three hundred factors in different parts of Italy and the Levant. He lent two hundred thousand crowns to the king, without which this prince could never have recovered Normandy. His industry in time of peace was of more service than Dunois and the Maid of Orleans had been in time of war. The persecuting so useful a man is, perhaps, a great stain to the memory of Charles VII. The motive of this persecution is not known: for who can tell the secret springs of the injustice and iniquity of mankind?

The king ordered him to be sent to prison, and the parliament of Paris tried him; all that they could prove against him was, that he had caused a Christian slave to be restored to his Turkish master, whom this slave had left and betrayed; and that he had sold arms to the sultan of Egypt. For these two facts, one of which was lawful, and the other meritorious, his estate was confiscated. He found more virtue in his clerks, than in the courtiers who ruined him: the former contributed to relieve him under his misfortunes. James Cœur removed to Cyprus, where he continued to carry on his trade, but never had the
courage

courage to return to his ungrateful country, though strongly invited.

The close of Charles's reign, however, proved happy enough to France, though very unhappy in regard to the king, whose latter days were embittered by the rebellions of his unnatural son, who was afterwards Louis XI.

C H A P. LXXXI.

Manners, Customs, and Commerce towards the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries.

I AM desirous rather to inquire into the state of human society in those days, to discover what was the manner of living in families, and what arts were cultivated; than to give a detail of battles and public calamities, the unhappy topic of historians, and the usual effects of human iniquity.

Towards the end of the thirteenth century, and in the beginning of the fourteenth, the Italians, notwithstanding their domestic dissensions, began to shake off that barbarous rust with which Europe had been covered since the fall of the Roman empire. The necessary arts still subsisted: artificers and merchants, whose obscurity preserves them from the ambition and fury of the great, may be compared to ants which silently make their nests, while eagles and vultures tear one another to pieces.

Even those rude ages produced some useful inventions, the effect of that mechanic genius with which nature endows particular men independently of philosophy. For instance, the secret of assisting the enfeebled sight of old people by means of spectacles was discovered towards the end of the thirteenth century. This useful invention is due to Alexander Spina. The construction of wind-mills is of the same date. La Flamma, who lived in the fourteenth century, is the first who makes mention of them. But the use of them

them was known long before to the Greeks and the Arabians; and they are also mentioned by the Arabian poets of the seventh century. The earthen ware, which was chiefly manufactured at Faenza, was used instead of porcelain. Glass windows had been discovered a long time before; but they were very scarce, and considered as an article of luxury. This art was introduced into England by the French, towards the year 1180, where it was considered as a high degree of magnificence.

In the thirteenth century, the Venetians were the only people that had the secret of making looking-glasses of crystal. There were some clocks in Italy; and that of Bologna was particularly famous. The more useful wonder of the compass was entirely owing to chance; but mankind had not sagacity enough at that time to make a proper use of this invention. Paper made of rags was invented towards the beginning of the fourteenth century. Cortusius, an historian of Padua, takes notice of one Pax, who erected the first manufacture in that city upwards of an hundred years before the invention of printing. Thus it is that the useful arts were gradually established, and most of them by obscure persons.

The other parts of Europe were far from having such cities as Venice, Genoa, Bologna, Sienna, Pisa, and Florence. In the towns of France, Germany, and England, almost all the houses were thatched. The same may be said of the poorer towns in Italy, such as Alexandria and Nice, which were stiled *della paglia*, from their being built of straw.

Though they had such large tracts of land over-run with woods, yet they had not as yet learnt to guard against the cold by the means of chimneys, an invention so useful, as well as ornamental to our modern apartments. The custom was for the whole family to sit in the middle of a smoaky hall, round a large stove, the tunnel of which passed through the ceiling.

La

La Flamma, according to the custom of injudicious authors, complains, in the fourteenth century, that frugal simplicity had given way to luxury. He regrets the times of Frederic Barbarossa, and of Frederic II. when in Milan, the capital of Lombardy, they eat flesh meat but three times a week. Wine was very scarce; they had no notion of wax candles; and even those of tallow were deemed luxury. He says, that the better sort of inhabitants made use of splinters of dry wood instead of candles. They had hot meat but three times a week, and wore woollen shirts. The most considerable citizens gave their daughters not above one hundred livres for their portion. But now, continues he, every thing is greatly changed; we all of us wear linen; the women dress in silk gowns, some of which are embroidered with gold and silver: they have two thousand livres for their fortunes; and even adorn their ears with gold pendants. And yet this luxury, of which he so greatly complains, falls short of what in our days is reckoned among the necessaries of the rich and industrious.

Table linen was very scarce in England; and wine was sold only by apothecaries as a cordial. The houses of private people were all of wood in Paris as well as in London. It was reckoned a kind of luxury to ride in a two-wheel cart through the ill-paved dirty streets of Paris, a luxury which was forbidden the wives of citizens by Philip the Fair. The following regulation under Charles VI. is well known, *nemo audeat dare præter duo fercula cum potagio*; let no one presume to treat with more than two dishes with a potage.

The following circumstance is alone sufficient to shew the great scarcity of money both in Scotland and England, as well as the rusticity, commonly called simplicity, of those days. We read in the public acts, that when the kings of Scotland came to the English court they had thirty shillings a day assigned them for their maintenance, twelve loaves, twelve cakes, and thirty bottles of wine.

And yet among the feudal lords and the principal prelates all the magnificence prevailed which the times would permit. This was the natural consequence of large possessions. The bishops had, for a long time, been accustomed never to go abroad without a great number of servants and horses to attend them. A council held at Lateran, in the year 1179, under pope Alexander III. reproaches them, that when they went to visit the monasteries, the latter were frequently obliged to sell all the church plate to defray the expences of their reception. The retinue of the archbishops was contracted by the canons of the council to fifty horses, that of the bishops to thirty, and that of the cardinals to five-and-twenty; for a cardinal, who had no bishopric, and consequently had no church lands, could not support the pomp of a bishop. This magnificence in the prelates appeared more odious than it does at present, because there was not then any middle rank between the great and the mean, the rich and the poor. Industry and commerce were able only with the help of time to form that middling rank which at present makes the riches of a nation. The use of plate was still unknown to most cities. Mussus, a Lombard writer of the fourteenth century, looks upon silver knives and forks, as also on silver spoons and cups as a great piece of luxury.

He says, that a man, who has nine or ten in family, with two horses to maintain, is obliged to spend annually three hundred florins; which in our days is about three thousand livres.

Money was therefore exceeding scarce in many parts of Italy, and much more so in France in the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries. The Florentines and the Lombards, who were the only people that carried on any trade in France and in England, together with the Jews their brokers, usually extorted twenty *per cent.* for interest. Great usury is the infallible sign of public poverty.

Charles V. king of France, had amassed some treasure by his long œconomy, by the prudent administration

tion of the crown lands, at that time the principal branch of the royal revenue, and by the imposts devised under Philip of Valois, which, though inconsiderable, raised great complaints among an impoverished people. His prime minister, the cardinal de la Grange, had but too greatly enriched himself at the public expence. All those treasures however were squandered away in other countries. The cardinal carried his to Avignon; the duke of Anjou wasted that of his brother king Charles V. in his unfortunate expedition into Italy; while France continued in a miserable condition, till towards the latter end of the reign of Charles VII.

It was far otherwise with the great trading cities of Italy; the inhabitants of which lived with conveniency and in opulence. The sweets of life were almost wholly confined to them, and at length the wealth and liberty they enjoyed, excited their genius, and elevated their courage.

C H A P. LXXXII.

Of the Arts and Sciences in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries.

THE Italian language was not yet formed at the time of Frederick II. This we find by the following verses of that emperor, which are the last example of the romance language free from the Teutonic asperity:

Plas me el cavalier Frances

E la donna Catalana

E L'ouvar Genoes

E la danza Trevisana

E lou cantar Provensales

Las man e cara d'Angles

E lou donzel de Toscana.

This is a more precious monument than one would imagine, and much superior to all those ruins of the middle age, so greedily inquired after by persons of more curiosity than judgment. It sufficiently proves that nature is invariably the same in the several nations mentioned by Frederick. The Catalan women are still, as they were in that emperor's time, the handsomest in Spain. The nobility of France have preserved the same martial air which was then in such great esteem. The English are still distinguished for handsome hands, and the dignity and regularity of their features. The damsels of Tuscany are more agreeable than those of other countries. The Genoese have still preserved their industry; and the natives of Provence their taste for poetry and singing. It was in Provence and Languedoc that the first improvements were made in the Romance language. The inhabitants of Provence taught the Italians. Nothing is so well known to the curious in these matters, as the following verses upon the Vaudois, in the year 1100.

*“ Que non volia maudir ne jura, ne mentir,
 “ N'occir, ne avoutrar, ne prene de altrui,
 “ Ne s'avengear deli suo enemi,
 “ Loz dison qu'es Vaudes & los feson morir.”*

“ Whoever refuses to curse, to swear, to lie, to kill,
 “ to commit adultery, to steal, to be revenged of his
 “ enemy; they say he is a Vaudois, and put him to
 “ death.”

This quotation hath likewise its use, inasmuch as it is a proof that all reformers have ever affected a severity of manners.

This jargon has unfortunately continued in the same state it was then in Provence and Languedoc, while the Italian language, assisted by Petrarch's pen, attained that force and elegance which, far from degenerating, has received great improvements. The Italian assumed its present form towards the end of the thirteenth

teenth century, at the time of the good king Roger, grandfather of the unfortunate Joan. Already had Danté the Florentine, illustrated the Tuscan language with that whimsical poem intitled *Comedia*, a work famous for natural beauties, and in many parts far superior to the corrupt taste of that age, being written with as much purity as if the author had been cotemporary with Ariosto and Tasso. It is not at all surprising, that Danté, being one of the chiefs of the Ghibeline faction, and having been persecuted by Boniface VIII. and Charles of Valois, should, in the course of that poem, have vented his complaints about the quarrels betwixt the priesthood and the empire. I shall take the liberty to insert here a passage of this poet concerning those dissensions. These monuments of the human mind are a kind of refreshment, after a long perusal of the calamities which have afflicted the earth.

*Soleva Roma, che'l buon mondo feo,
Duo soli aver, che l' una e l'altra strada
Facen vedere, e del mondo, e di Deo.
L'un l'altro ha spento, ed è giunta la spada
Col pastorale, e l'uno e l'altro insieme,
Per viva forza mal convien che vada:
Perocchè giunti, l'un l'altro non teme.
Se non mi credi, pon mente alla spiga:
Ch'ogni erba si conosce per lo seme.*

Danté del Purgatorio, Cant. 16.

To Danté succeeded Petrarch, who was born in 1304 at Arrezzo, a city celebrated also for giving birth to Guido Arelinus. Under Petrarch the Italian tongue received a further degree of purity, with all the softness of which it is susceptible. In these two poets, but especially in Petrarch, we meet with a great number of passages that resemble those fine antiques, which have the beauty of antiquity, together with the freshness of modern times. You will excuse me, if to give you a specimen of his manner of writing, I take the liberty

liberty to insert the beginning of his beautiful ode to the fountain of Vaucluse.

*Cbiare, fresche, e dolci acque,
Ove le belle membra
Pose colei, che sola a me par donna;
Gentil ramo, ove piacque
(Con sospir mi rimembra)
A lei, di fare al bel fianco colonna;
Herba, e fior, che la gonna
Leggiadra ricoverse
Con l'angelico seno;
Aer sacro sereno,
Ov' amor co begli occhi il cor m'aperse;
Date udientia insieme
A le dolenti mie parole estreme.*

These poems, called *Cazoni*, are esteemed his principal performances. His other works did him less honour; he rendered the fountain of Vaucluse, Laura, and his own name, immortal. If he had never been in love he would have been much less known. The above specimen must shew the immense distance there was at that time between the Italians and all other nations. I chose rather to give you even a superficial idea of Petrarch's genius, and of the elegant softness which constitutes his character, than to repeat what so many others have said concerning the honours that were offered him at Paris, as well as those which he received at Rome, together with his triumphant procession to the capitol in 1341; a celebrated homage which his amazed cotemporaries paid to so great a genius, unrivalled indeed at that time, but afterwards surpassed by Ariosto and Tasso. It is worthy of observation, that his family had been exiled from Tuscany, and stripped of their estate, during the disputes between the Guelfs and Gibelines; and that the Florentines sent Boccace to him, to beg he would honour his country with his presence, and accept of the restitution of his estate. Never did Greece, even in its most glorious

ous days, shew more taste and esteem for superior talents.

It was this Boccace that ascertained the Tuscan language; he is still the chief model in prose with regard both to exactness and purity of style, as well as to the natural manner of writing a narrative. After the language had been perfected by these two writers, it received no further change; while all the other nations in Europe, not even excepting the Greeks, have altered their idiom.

There was a succession of Italian poets, whose writings have all been handed down to posterity. For Pulci wrote after Petrarch; and Bojardo count of Scandiano, succeeded Pulci; but Ariosto surpassed them both in fertility of imagination. Let us not forget that Petrarch and Boccace had celebrated the praises of the unfortunate Joan of Naples, whose mind was so far improved as to be sensible of their merit, and who was even one of their disciples. At that time she was intirely devoted to the polite arts, the charms of which obliterated the remembrance of the criminal days of her former marriage. The change of manners arising from the culture of her mind, ought to have averted the catastrophe which ended her days.

The polite arts, which all go hand-in-hand, and generally decay and rise together, were at that time emerging in Italy from barbarism. Cimabue, without any assistance, was, in great measure, a new inventor of painting, in the thirteenth century. Giotto drew some pictures which to this day are beheld with pleasure. There is still extant that celebrated piece of his, which has been set in Mosaic, and represents the Prince of the Apostles walking upon the water: it is to be seen over the great gate of St. Peter's church at Rome. Brunelleschi began to reform the Gothic architecture. Guido of Arezzo, long before that time, had invented the modern notes of musick, and spread this art by rendering it more easy.

We are indebted to the Tuscans alone for all these fine inventions. By mere strength of genius they re-
vived

vived all those arts, before the little remains of Greek learning, together with that language, removed from Constantinople into Italy, after the conquest of the Ottomans. Florence was at that time a second Athens; and it is remarkable, that among the orators who were deputed by most of the cities of Italy to harangue Boniface VIII. upon his exaltation to the holy see, eighteen of them were natives of this city. By this it appears, that it is not to the refugees of Constantinople we are indebted for the restoration of letters: those persons were capable of teaching the Italians nothing more than the Greek tongue.

It may seem wonderful, that so many great geniuses should have started up of a sudden in Italy, without protection, or any model to go by, in the midst of dissensions and wars: but among the Romans Lucretius wrote his beautiful poem on nature, Virgil his *Bucolics*, and Cicero his philosophical works, amidst the horrors of civil wars. When once a language begins to be ascertained, it is a kind of instrument which eminent artists find ready to their hands, and which they make use of for their purposes, without troubling their heads about who governs, or who disturbs the earth.

Though Tuscany alone received those rays of light, yet there were men of some abilities in other countries. St. Bernard and Abelard in France, in the twelfth century, might be looked upon as men of genius: but their language was a barbarous jargon; and they paid tribute in Latin to the corrupt taste of the times. The Latin hymns in rhyme during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries are the last stroke of barbarism. Not so did Horace sing the secular games. Scholastic theology, the bastard daughter of Aristotle's philosophy, ill translated and misunderstood, did more real prejudice to reason, and to useful studies, than ever they received from the Huns and Vandals.

The dramatic art did not exist in those days. In Italy they were acquainted with nothing of the kind, but certain simple representations of some particular stories

stories in the Old and New Testament, and from thence the custom of playing mysteries passed into France. These exhibitions came originally from Constantinople, where they had been introduced by the poet St. Gregory Nazianzen, in opposition to the dramatic pieces of the ancient Greeks and Romans; and as the chorusses in the Greek tragedies were religious hymns, and their theatre held a sacred part, Gregory, and his successors, composed sacred tragedies; but unhappily this new theatre had by no means that pre-eminence over the stage of Athens, which the Christian religion had over that of the Gentiles. There are still some remains of these pious farces in the strolling theatres in Italy. On holidays, or other times of religious festivals, they represented the birth and sufferings of our Saviour. These customs were soon adopted by the common people in the northern nations. These subjects have since been treated in a more suitable manner, of which we have instances in those little operas called *Oratorios*; and the French have exhibited the most masterly productions on their stage, taken from stories in the Old Testament.

The brotherhood of the passion in France, towards the end of the fifteenth century, brought Jesus Christ in person upon the stage. Had the French language been then as majestic and pure, as it was low and groveling, if among so many dull and illiterate persons there had been one man of genius, it is not improbable that the death and sufferings of a just and a righteous person, persecuted by a Jewish priest, and condemned by a Roman prætor, might have furnished matter for a sublime work; but this required an enlightened age, and such an age would not have permitted these kind of representations.

The polite arts were not extinct in the East. And since the poetical compositions of Sady the Persian are still repeated daily by the Persians, Turks, and Arabians, they must surely have some merit. He was cotemporary with Petrarch, to whom he was equal in reputation. It is true, that in general the eastern

nations have seldom had any share of good taste. Their writings are like the bombast titles of their sovereigns, in which there is frequent mention of the sun and moon. The spirit of slavery seems naturally fond of high sounding words; whereas that of liberty is nervous; and real greatness assumes the stile of simplicity. The Orientals have no delicacy, because the women do not mix in company with the men. They have neither order nor method; and this is because they give loose to their imagination amid the solitary retreats in which they spend the greater part of their days; and the imagination itself is naturally subject to irregular flights. They have been ever strangers to real eloquence, such as that of Demosthenes and Cicero. Who have they to persuade in those eastern climes? None but slaves: and yet they have here and there some beautiful ideas; their words are picturesque; and though their figures are oftentimes high swelling and incoherent, still they have a kind of sublimity. Perhaps you will be pleased to see the following translation of a passage from Sady, which resembles some of the sublime strokes of the Hebrew prophets: it is a description of the grandeur of the Deity; a common place indeed, but which will serve as a specimen of the Persian genius.

He knows full well e'en that which ne'er existed:
With sounds that ne'er were heard his ear is fill'd:
Tho' prince, he wants no service on the knee,
And tho' a judge, requires no written law.
The pencil of his sure eternal prescience
Traced out our features in our mother's womb.
From east to west he bids the sun to roll,
And scatters rubies mid the rugged mountains.
He takes two drops of water: this forms man,
That the pearl he places in the deep.
Existence rose from nothing at his word.
He speaks; and lo the universe recoils
Into the immensity of space and void.
He speaks; and soon the universe returns
From chaos to a state of bright existence.

If

If the belles lettres were thus cultivated on the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates, it is a proof that the other arts which contribute to the amusements of life were not neglected. Superfluities are not thought of till necessities are first acquired. But those necessities were wanting almost all over Europe. For what did the inhabitants of Germany, France, England, Spain, and the northern parts of Lombardy know at that time? Nothing but the barbarous customs of sieges, equally uncertain and tumultuous; nothing but duels, tournaments, scholastic theology, and witchcraft.

In many churches they still celebrated the festival of the ass, as well as that of the fools. They used to lead an ass to the altar, and chant out an anthem, *Amen, Amen, Asine; eh, eh, eh, Mr. Ass; eh, eh, eh, Mr. Ass.*

Du Cange, and his continuers, who were very accurate compilers, quote a manuscript upwards of five hundred years old, in which he found the following hymn of the ass:

*Orientis partibus
Adventavit asinus
Pulcher & fortissimus.*

A young damsel, representing the mother of God, journeying into Egypt, mounted on this ass, and holding a young child in her arms, led the procession; and at the end of the mass, instead of repeating the words, *Ita missa est*, the priest set a braying three times with all his strength, and the people answered him with the same cry.

This more than savage superstition had nevertheless its origin in Italy. And although in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries some few Italians began to emerge from darkness, yet the populace in general continued plunged in ignorance. They had entertained a notion at Verona, that the ass which carried Jesus Christ had walked upon the sea, and had come through the Gulph of Venice as far as the banks of the Adige,

where our Saviour assigned him a certain field for pasturage, in which he lived a long time, and in which he afterwards died. The bones of this animal were inclosed within a case, made in the shape of an afs, which was deposited in the church of Notre Dame des Orgues, or our Lady of the Organs, under the care of four canons; and these relicts were carried about three times a year with great solemnity.

The afs of Verona was the making of our Lady of Loretto. Pope Boniface VIII. seeing that the procession of the afs brought such a concourse of strangers, be-thought himself that the Virgin Mary's house must certainly bring a still greater number; and in this he was not deceived. He accordingly gave his apostolic sanction to this fable; and the people, who were capable of believing that an afs had walked upon the sea from Jerusalem to Verona, were easily persuaded that the Virgin Mary's house might have been transported from Nazareth to Loretto. This little house was soon incased in a magnificent church; and, in a short time, by the pilgrimages of devotees and the presents of several crowned heads, this temple became as rich as that of Ephesus. The Italians, at least, enriched themselves through the blind superstition of other nations; but at the same time they gave into this superstition themselves by following the popular prejudices, and the spirit of the times. You may have had many occasions to observe that this fanaticism, to which mankind have a natural propensity, has served to render them not only more stupid, but more wicked. Pure religion softens the manners by enlightening the understanding, whereas superstition, by blinding the judgment, inspires only rage and cruelty.

There was at that time in Normandy, which is called the country of wisdom, an abbot of the cuckolds, who used to be carried about in many towns in a kind of chariot, drawn by four horses, with a mitre on his head and a crozier in his hand, dispensing benedictions, and issuing mandates.

There

There was also a king of the stews established at court by letters-patent. He was originally the chief or judge of a petty guard belonging to the palace, and afterwards a court fool, who used to exact a certain fee from all the pick-pockets and women of the town. There was not a town but what had a society of artificers, burghers, and even of women, among whom the most extravagant ceremonies were stamped with the title of religious mysteries; and from hence came the fraternity of free-masons, an institution which alone has escaped the destroying hand of time, to which all the others have submitted. The most contemptible, though at the same time the most numerous of all these fraternities, was that of the flagellants. It had its first origin in the insolence of some priests, who took advantage of the weakness of public penitents so far as to scourge them. We see the remains of this custom in the little wands which the penitentiaries at Rome carry in their hands on the days of any solemn procession. The monks at length came to scourge themselves, on a supposition that nothing could be more pleasing to God than the scarified back of a friar. In the eleventh century one Peter Damien persuaded several of the laity to exercise this discipline on themselves stark naked. In 1260 there were several fraternities of pilgrims, who went through all Italy armed with rods. They afterwards made the tour of a great part of Europe. This association, in time, grew up into a sect, which it was found necessary to suppress.

While these troops of rogues were running about the world in this manner, there were ideots who walked at the head of all their processions with a plaited gown, a little bell, and a fool's bauble; a custom which is still preserved in Flanders and in Germany. The whole literature of our northern nations consisted of the farces of the *Foolish Mother*, and the *Prince of Fools*, in the vulgar tongue.

They talked of nothing but revelations, exorcisms, and enchantments. The wife of Philip III. was accused
of

of adultery; and the king sent to consult a nun, in order to know whether the queen was guilty or not. The children of Philip the Fair entered into an association in writing, whereby they promised mutually to assist each other against all persons that should attempt to destroy them by magic. By a decree of parliament a witch was condemned to the flames, who, in conjunction with the devil, had forged a deed in favour of Robert of Artois. The illness of Charles VI. was attributed to witchcraft, and they sent for a forcerer to cure him. In England, the dutchess of Gloucester was condemned to do public penance in St. Paul's church; and her pretended accomplice was burnt alive as a forceress.

When scenes like these, the horrid fruits of credulity, happened to the first personages in Europe, it is easy to conceive what the private citizens must have been exposed to. But this was the least of their misfortunes.

Germany, France, Spain, and indeed all but the great trading cities of Italy, had hardly any sort of civil government. The walled towns of Germany and France were plundered during the civil wars; and the Greek empire was over-run by the Turks. Spain was still divided between the Christians and the Arabian Mahometans; and each party was frequently rent by intestine wars. In short, under Philip of Valois, Edward III. Louis of Bavaria and Clement VI. a general pestilence carried off those who had escaped the sword and famine.

Just before this fourteenth century, we have seen how Europe was dispeopled and impoverished by the crusades. If we ascend from those crusades to the times which succeeded the death of Charlemagne, we shall find the same scenes of misery, and greater barbarism. The comparison between those times and the present, ought to make us sensible of our happiness, notwithstanding that almost invincible proneness of human nature to prefer the past to present times.

We

We are not however to imagine that all were in this state of ignorance and barbarism; there were men of eminent virtue in all stations, on the throne, and in the cloister, among the laity as well as the clergy. But neither a St. Louis, nor a St. Ferdinand, were able to heal the wounds that had disfigured humanity. The long quarrel between the emperors and the popes, the obstinate struggle which Rome made for her liberty, both against the German Cæsars and the Roman pontiffs, the frequent schisms, and at length the great schism of the west, prevented the popes, who were elected in times of confusion, from practising such virtues as more peaceable times would have inspired. Might not the general corruption of morals reach even them? The character of men depends on the age they live in; few, very few, ever rise above the manners of the times. Neither the flagitious crimes into which several popes were hurried, nor their scandalous lives, though countenanced by general example, can be buried in oblivion. Of what use then is the description of their vices, and of their disasters? To shew the happiness of Rome, since it has been the seat of order and tranquillity. What greater benefit can we receive from the many vicissitudes exhibited in this work, than to convince us that every nation has been unhappy, till the laws and the legislative power have been properly settled?

As a few monarchs and pontiffs, worthy of better times, could not put a stop to such a number of disorders; so a few men of understanding, who were born in the darkness of northern climates, were unable to introduce the arts and sciences among their countrymen.

Charles V. king of France, in vain attempted to encourage abilities, by making a collection of nine hundred volumes a century before the Vatican library was founded by Nicholas V. The soil was not prepared to bear those exotic plants. Collections have been made of the wretched compositions of that time; which may be compared to raising a heap of stones out
 I of

of old ruins, at the same time that you are surrounded with palaces. He was obliged to send to Pisa for an astrologer; and Catharine, the daughter of that astrologer, who wrote in French, pretends that Charles said, "So long as learning shall be honoured in this kingdom, it will continue to flourish." But learning was unknown at that time, and much less had they any taste. How indeed was it possible for an unhappy country, torn to pieces by civil wars, without commerce and without laws, to be in any other state than that of barbarism? The French nobility possessed only the advantage of making a better appearance than other nations.

When Charles of Valois, brother of Philip the Fair, went to Italy, the Lombards, and even the Tuscans, aped the French fashions. Those fashions were extravagantly whimsical; such as a bodice laced behind, like womens stays in our time: large hanging sleeves, and a great cowl, the point of which hung down to the ground. Yet the French gentlemen had a graceful appearance in this masquerade, and justified the saying of Frederick II. *Plaz me el cavalier Francez*. It would have been better had they been acquainted with the military discipline; France then would not have been a prey to foreigners under Philip of Valois, John and Charles VI. But how came the English to be better soldiers? Perhaps it was because, as they fought at some distance from their country, they were more sensible of the necessity of discipline; or rather, because the courage of the English is cooler, and more the result of reflexion.

C H A P. LXXXIII.

Infranchisements, Privileges of Cities, States General.

FROM the general anarchy of Europe, and such a multitude of disasters, arose the inestimable blessing of liberty, to whose kind influence the imperial cities, and

and so many other towns owe their present flourishing condition.

You have already observed, that at the beginning of the feudal anarchy, almost all the towns were peopled rather with bondmen than with citizens, as is still the case in Poland, where there are only three or four cities that can possess any lands, and where the inhabitants are the property of their lord, who has over them the power of life and death. It was formerly the same in Germany and in France. The emperors began with infranchising several towns: and these so early as the thirteenth century united for their common defence against the lords of the castles who subsisted by plunder.

In France, Louis the Fat followed this example on his own demesnes, in order to weaken the lords who waged war against him. The small towns purchased their liberty afterwards of the lords themselves, who wanted money to maintain the honour of chivalry in Palestine.

In short, in 1167 pope Alexander III. declared, in the name of a council, *that all Christians ought to be exempt from servitude*. This law alone should render his memory dear to all nations; as the efforts he made in support of the liberty of Italy, ought to render his name precious to the Italians.

It was in virtue of this law that Louis X. declared a long time after in his charters, that all the bondmen still remaining in France, ought to be set free: *because*, said he, *it is the kingdom of the Franks*. He made them indeed pay for this liberty; but could they purchase it too dear?

Yet it was only by degrees and with great difficulty, that the people recovered their natural right. Louis X. could not oblige the lords his vassals to do for the subjects of their demesnes what he had done for his. The husbandmen, and even the burghers themselves, for a long time continued in a state of villenage, as they do still in several provinces of Germany. It was not till the reign of Charles VII. that servitude was entirely abolished in France, by the weakening of the lords. Even the English themselves contributed greatly

to this revolution, by bringing with them that spirit of liberty which is the characteristic of their nation.

Even before the reign of Louis X. the kings of France ennobled several citizens. Philip the Bold, son of St. Louis, ennobled *Raoul the goldsmith*: Not that he was a goldsmith, for the ennobling of such an artisan would have been ridiculous; but because he kept the king's money. For these depositaries were called goldsmiths, a name which they still bear in London, where many of the ancient words and customs of France are still preserved. St. Louis, without doubt, ennobled his surgeon La Brosse, since we find that he made him his chamberlain.

The communities of towns had begun under Philip the Fair in 1301, to be admitted to the states general, which at that time were substituted to the ancient parliaments of the nation, composed before of lords and prelates. The third estate gave their vote under the name of request; and this request they presented on their knees. The custom has still obtained that the deputies of the third estate should be upon their knees when they speak to the king, as the gentlemen of the long robe at the beds of justice. These first states general were held in order to oppose the pretensions of pope Boniface VIII. We must confess, that the condition of humanity was very wretched, when there were only two orders in the kingdom, one composed of the lords of fiefs, who did not constitute the five thousandth part of the nation; and the other of the clergy, who were still less numerous, and who by their sacred institution are designed for a superior ministry, quite foreign to temporal affairs. The body of the nation had hitherto passed for nothing. This is one of the real causes which kept the kingdom of France in a languishing condition, by checking industry. If in Holland and England the legislature had consisted only of the lords spiritual and temporal, these people would never have been able, in the war of 1701, to hold the balance of Europe. In Venice, Genoa, and other republics, though the people had no share in the government, yet they were never held in slavery. The
citizens

citizens of Italy were very different from the burghers of the countries of the North ; the burghers in Germany and in France were dependents on a lord, a bishop or the king, and belonged to one man ; whereas the citizens of Italy belonged only to the republic.

Philip the Fair, who is charged with want of probity in the article of coin, with persecuting the Templars, and with perhaps too violent an animosity against pope Boniface VIII. and his memory, therefore, did a great service to the nation, by summoning the third estate to the general assemblies of France.

About this time the house of commons began to establish itself in England, having greatly increased its weight so early as the year 1300. Thus, in almost every part of Europe, the chaos of government was reduced to some order, by those very calamities which the anarchy of the feudal system had produced in every country. But though the people resumed their liberty and their natural rights, yet it was a long time before they could shake off that barbarism, which they had derived from a long state of servitude. It is true they acquired their liberty, and began to be considered as men ; but as yet they were neither more polished, nor more industrious. The bloody wars of Edward III. and Henry V. reduced the people of France to a worse condition than that of slavery ; nor did they begin to recover from it till the latter end of Charles the VIIth's reign. The people were not less unhappy in England after the reign of Henry V. In Germany their fate was not so hard in the reigns of Wenceslaus and Sigismund, because the imperial cities had already acquired a considerable degree of power.

C H A P. LXXXIV.

Of Taxes and Coin.

THE third estate did nothing more in the states general, held under Philip of Valois in 1345, than contribute to the establishment of the first impost

of the royal aid, and of the tax upon salt. But it is certain, that if the states had been more frequently assembled in France, they would have acquired more authority; for under the government of this very Philip of Valois, who was become odious by the debasing of the coin, and contemptible through his misfortunes, the estates themselves appointed commissaries of the three orders in 1355, to collect the money which they had granted the king. Those who give what they please, and as they please, do in some measure partake of the supreme authority. This is the reason that the kings of France never summoned these assemblies, except when they could not do without them. Thus through want of practice in examining the wants, the resources, and the strength of the nation, the states general never had that steady spirit, nor that knowledge of business for which all regular bodies are distinguished. As they were summoned but seldom, and at great intervals of time, they were obliged to inform themselves of the laws and customs, instead of making them; in short, they were in a state of surprise and uncertainty. The parliament of England assumed greater privileges, by establishing and supporting its right of representing the body of the nation. And here especially the difference of the two people lies: they both set out with the same principles; yet their government, which at that time was quite alike, is now intirely different. The estates of Arragon, and of Hungary, as well as the diets of Germany, had still greater privileges.

The states general of France, or rather that part of France which fought under king Charles VII. against the usurper Henry V. generously laid a general land-tax in 1426, in the very height of the war, at a time of scarcity, when they were even afraid of leaving their lands uncultivated. The third estate made use of these very words in their address to the king. This impost has been continued ever since. Before that time the kings lived on their demesnes, but Charles VII. had scarce any left; and had it not been for the brave warriors

riors who sacrificed themselves for him and for their country, and likewise for the constable de Richemont, who had a great ascendant over him, but at the same time served him at his own expence, he must have been undone.

Soon after, the husbandmen, who before that time had paid the land-tax to their lords, in quality of bondmen, paid this tribute to the king in quality of subjects. Not but the kings of France had also levied a land-tax, even before St. Louis, within the districts of the royal patrimony. Few readers are unacquainted with the tax of *bread and wine*, which at first was paid in kind, and afterwards in money. The French word *taille* signifying a tax, is derived from the custom which the collectors had of marking on a little tally, what the persons liable to contribution had given: nothing was more uncommon in those days, than for the common people to write. Even the very customs of cities were not written; and it was this same Charles VII. that ordered them to be reduced to writing in 1454, when he had restored that order and tranquillity, of which this kingdom has been so long deprived, and when such a series of misfortunes had given birth to a new form of government.

In this essay, I am taking rather a general survey of the fate of mankind, than of the revolutions of thrones. History should pay more attention than it does to the human race: here it is that each writer ought to say *homo sum*; but instead of that, we find the generality of historians describing battles.

The state of the coin was a point which still disturbed the public tranquillity of Europe, as well as the peace and prosperity of private families. Each lord struck his own coin, and altered the standard and weight at will, doing a lasting prejudice to himself for a transitory advantage. The crowned heads indeed had been obliged, by the necessity of the times, to set this fatal example. I have already observed, that the gold of one part of Europe, and especially of France, had been consumed in Asia, and in Africa, by the misfortunes of
the

the crusades. They were therefore obliged, as new wants incessantly pressed them, to increase the numerical value of money. At the time of Charles V. after he had reconquered his kingdom, the livre was worth seven numerical livres; under Charlemagne it had the real weight of a livre, or a pound. Therefore the livre under Charles V. was, in reality, only the seventh part of the ancient livre. Consequently a family, whose whole subsistence consisted in an ancient service, in an infeoffment, or in a duty payable in money, was become seven times the poorer.

The following still more striking example may enable us to form an idea of the small quantity of specie that circulated in France. This very Charles V. decreed that the king's younger children should have an appenage of twelve thousand livres a year: these twelve thousand livres are not worth more than a hundred and fourscore thousand livres present money. What a small provision for a king's son! However, there was the same scarcity of specie in Germany, Spain, and England.

Edward III. was the first that struck gold coin: and it may be remembered that the Romans had none till six hundred and fifty years after the foundation of their city.

The whole revenue of Henry V. king of England, amounted only to fifty-six thousand pounds sterling, and yet with this weak supply he attempted the conquest of France. After the battle of Agincourt he was obliged to return to London, in order to borrow money, and to pledge his jewels to renew the war. In fine, he pushed his conquests rather by the sword than by gold.

In Sweden they had no money but of copper and iron. Nor in Denmark had they any silver, but what had been brought into that country in very small quantities by the trade of Lubeck.

In this general scarcity of silver, which France experienced after the crusades, king Philip the Fair not only raised the fictitious and ideal value of specie, but he

he ordered some to be coined that had too much alloy. In short, it was counterfeit coin, and the disturbances which this operation occasioned, served only to render the nation more unhappy. Philip of Valois went farther than Philip the Fair; he made the officers of the mint swear by the evangelists, that they would keep the secret. In his ordinance he enjoins them to deceive the merchants, *in such a manner, that they may not perceive there has been any alteration in the weight.* But how could he flatter himself that this fraud should remain undiscovered? And what times must those have been when they were obliged to have recourse to such artifices! What times, when all the feudal lords since the reign of St. Louis did the very thing for which Philip the Fair, and Philip of Valois, have been so greatly condemned? In France, those lords sold their right of coinage to the sovereign: in Germany they have all preserved it; from whence great abuses, though not so general, nor so pernicious, have frequently arisen.

C H A P. LXXXV.

Of the Parliament of Paris till the Reign of Charles VII.

PHILIP the Fair, who occasioned so much mischief by debasing the sterling coin of St. Louis, did however an essential service to the people in summoning the burghers, who in effect are the body of the nation, to the general assemblies. The institution of a supreme court of judicature, which resides at Paris under the name of parliament, was another no less useful improvement for which the people are indebted to the same prince.

All that has been written concerning the origin and nature of the parliament of Paris, affords us but a very imperfect light, because the transitions from ancient to new usages are usually insensible. Some will have it

that the chambers of inquests and requests exactly represent the ancient conquerors of Gaul: others pretend, that the parliament has no other right to administer justice, but because the ancient peers were the judges of the nation, and the parliament is called the *court of peers*.

Only a very little attention is required to rectify these notions. It is certain that there was a great alteration made in France under Philip the Fair, in the beginning of the fourteenth century; which is, that the great feudal and aristocratical government was insensibly demolished in the king of France's demesnes; that Philip the Fair instituted almost at the same time the parliaments of Paris, Toulouse, Normandy, and the general sessions of Troye, for the administering of justice; that the parliament of Paris was the most considerable, because of the extent of its jurisdiction; that the same Philip the Fair fixed it at Paris, and that Philip the Long rendered it perpetual. This court became the depositary and the interpreter of the ancient and new laws, the guardian of the rights of the crown, and the oracle of the nation. But it could not be said to represent the nation, for to do this, it must be either nominated by the people, or have an inherent right in its own person. The officers of the parliament (the peers excepted) were named by the king, paid by the king, and removeable by the king.

The king's council, the states general, and the parliament, were three very different things. The states general were really the ancient parliament of the whole nation, to which were added the deputies of the commons. The king's council was composed of such great officers as he thought proper to admit, and especially of the peers of the realm, all of whom were princes of the blood: the court of judicature, known by the name of parliament, and established at Paris, was at first composed of bishops and knights, assisted by clerks, either ecclesiastics or laymen, well versed in judicial proceedings.

The

The peers must certainly have had a right of sitting in this court, since they were originally the judges of the nation. But even if they had had no such right, this would not have hindered the parliament from being a supreme court of judicature; just as in Germany, the imperial chamber is a supreme court, though neither the electors, nor the other princes of the empire ever sit there; and as the council of Castile is a supreme court, though the grandees of Spain have no seats in that assembly.

This parliament however was very different from the old field meetings in March and May, whose name it retained. The peers had indeed the right of sitting in this court; but these peers were not such as they are now in England, the only nobles of the kingdom. They were princes who held of the crown; and when new peers were created, the king durst not but chuse them from among the princes. When Champagne ceased to be a peerage, in consequence of Philip the Fair's having acquired it by marriage, he erected Britany and Artois into peerages. Doubtless the sovereigns of those countries did not judge causes in the parliament of Paris; but a great many bishops did. In the beginning this new parliament met four times a year; the members were often changed, and the king paid for each of their sessions out of his treasury.

These parliaments were called *sovereign courts*; the president had the title of sovereign of the body, which signified no more than the head; as appears by these express words in the ordinance of Philip the Fair; *that no master shall absent himself from the chamber, without leave of his sovereign*. I should also observe, that in the beginning no one was allowed to plead by their attorney, they were obliged to come and make their appearance themselves in court, unless they had a particular dispensation from the king.

If the bishops had preserved their right of assisting at the sessions of parliament, it might in time have become a perpetual assembly of the states general. But they were excluded from thence under Philip the Long,

in 1320. In the beginning they presided in parliament, and took place of the chancellor. The first layman who presided in this court by the king's order, in 1320, was a count of Boulogne. The gentlemen of the law took only the title of counsellors till towards the year 1350. In process of time the lawyers becoming presidents, wore the mantle of ceremony belonging to the knights. They had the privileges of noblemen, and were oftentimes called *knights of the law*. But the ancient noble families who had acquired their titles by arms, ever shewed a contempt for this peaceful nobility. In fact, we see that the descendants of lawyers are not to this day admitted into the chapters in Germany. But it is a relict of ancient barbarism thus to annex a mark of degradation to one of the noblest functions of humanity, that of administering justice.

It may be said, in answer to this, that it is not the function of distributing justice that is deemed derogatory, since the peers of the realm, and even sovereigns themselves, have executed this function; but that certain men of a low extraction, having been at first introduced into the parliament of Paris, solely to carry on the causes, and not to give their voices, and having afterwards assumed the rights and privileges of nobles, to whom alone it belonged to be the judges of the people, they ought not to be admitted to share those honours which appertain incommunicably to the body of nobles. The celebrated Fenelon, archbishop of Cambray, in a letter to the French academy, says, "That a person to be qualified to write the history of France, should be well versed in the ancient customs of the nation, and that he should know, for instance, that the counsellors of parliament were originally serfs or vassals who had studied the laws of their country, and who assisted the nobles with their advice in the court of parliament." This may be true, in respect to some who raised themselves by their merit; but it is still a greater truth, that the major part of the counsellors were not serfs, but the sons of creditable burghers, who had been a long time enfranchised, and lived as freemen under

under the protection of the king, whose burghers they were. This order of citizens has undoubtedly at all times, and in every country, better opportunities of acquiring a knowledge in their profession than persons born in slavery

This tribunal was, as you know, the same as that which in England is called the court of King's Bench. The kings of England, who were vassals to those of France, imitated all the customs of their lords paramount. There was a king's attorney in the parliament of Paris, and there is one in the court of King's Bench in England. The chancellor of France may preside in the French parliament; the chancellor of England may do the same in the King's Bench*. The king, and the house of lords in England may set aside the decrees of the court of King's Bench, in like manner as the king of France, with his council of state, sets aside the arrets of the parliament; and as he likewise might, with the high barons and the nobles in the general assembly of the states, which are the parliament of the nation. The court of King's Bench cannot enact laws; neither can the parliament of Paris. The very word Bench shews the great affinity between these courts: the bench of presidents still retains its name with us, and is now called the *Great Bench*.

We have already remarked, that the form of the English government has not changed like ours. The general assembly of the English states has always subsisted; they have shared in the legislation: whereas ours, by being so early convoked, are grown out of use. The courts of justice, which we call parliaments, having become perpetual, and being considerably increased, have insensibly acquired, partly by the concession of the kings, and partly by custom, and even the unhappiness of the times, certain privileges which

* This is a mistaken notion of M. de Voltaire. The lord chancellor having no seat or authority in the court of King's Bench. T.

they never enjoyed either under Philip the Fair, his son, or Louis XI.

The chief distinction of the parliament of Paris above the other parliaments of the kingdom, arises from the custom which the kings of France introduced, of having all their treaties and edicts registered in the chamber of parliament, as the most authentic repository. In other respects, this chamber never interfered in any affairs of state or of the revenues. Whatever retarded the regal revenue, or the imposition of taxes, was incontestably the department of the chamber of accounts. The first remonstrance of the parliament, touching the revenue, was in the reign of Francis I.

All things are more subject to change in France than in any other nation. There was an ancient custom, by which no sentence inflicting the pain of death could be executed till such sentence was first signed by the king. This custom is still in force in England, and many other states; and nothing can be more just and humane. Fanaticism, party fury, and ignorance, have condemned many innocent citizens to lose their lives. These citizens belong to the king, that is to say, to the state; but by these practices the country is robbed of a subject, and his family is rendered infamous, without the person who is the representative of that family knowing any thing of the matter. How many innocent persons have we seen accused of heresy, witchcraft, and a thousand imaginary crimes, whose lives might have been saved by a king of knowledge and understanding.

But Charles VI. was so far from being such a person, that he was in that deplorable situation, which makes a man the sport of his fellow creatures.

It was in this perpetual parliament established at Paris in the palace of St. Louis, that Charles the VIth held that famous bed of justice the 23d of December 1420, in the presence of Henry V. king of England; and it was there he nominated *his beloved son Henry heir regent of the kingdom*. It was there the king's son was called only *Charles the pretended dauphin*, and that all the accomplices of the murder of John Sans peur, or the
Fearless,

Fearless, duke of Burgundy, were declared guilty of high treason, and excluded from the right of succession. This was in reality condemning the dauphin without naming him.

Further, it is asserted, that the registers of the parliament, in the year 1420, take notice, that the dauphin (afterwards Charles VII.) had been previously summoned three times by sound of trumpet in the month of January, and that for default of appearing he was sentenced to perpetual banishment: *from which sentence*, says this register, *he appealed to God and to his sword*. If this register be true, there must have been very near a whole year's interval between the outlawry and the bed of justice, which confirmed this fatal decree. But it is not at all astonishing that such a sentence passed. Philip duke of Burgundy, son of the murdered duke, was all powerful in Paris; the dauphin's mother had conceived an implacable aversion to her son; the king, bereft of his understanding, was in the hands of foreigners; and to conclude the whole, the dauphin had punished one crime by the perpetration of another still more horrid, having caused his relation John duke of Burgundy to be murdered in his own presence, after drawing him into a snare upon the faith of the most solemn oaths. We must likewise consider the spirit of the times. This very Henry V. king of England, and regent of France, was imprisoned, when only prince of Wales, by order of one of the judges, for giving him a box on the ear as he sat upon the bench.

The same century produced another instance of extreme severity of justice. A ban of Croatia dared to condemn Elizabeth, regent of Hungary, to be drowned, for being guilty of the murder of king Charles of Durazzo; and the sentence was accordingly executed.

The sentence passed on the dauphin by the parliament was of another kind; for it was dictated by superior force. They took no cognizance of John duke of Burgundy when he assassinated the duke of Orleans,
and

and yet they proceeded against the dauphin, in order to punish the murder of an assassins.

In reading the lamentable history of those times, we ought to remember, that after the famous treaty of Troyes, which transferred the crown of France to Henry V. king of England, there were two parliaments at the same time, as there were two at the time of the league, about three hundred years afterwards; but every thing was double in the confusion that happened under Charles VI. There were two kings, two queens, two parliaments, two universities of Paris, and each party had its marshals, and its great officers.

It is likewise worthy of observation, that in those days when a peer of the realm was to be tried, the king was obliged to preside in court. In consequence of this custom Charles VII. the last year of his life, sat at the head of the judges who condemned the duke of Alençon; a custom which since then has appeared inconsistent with justice, and unworthy of royal majesty; because the presence of the sovereign seems to constrain the judges, and to become a circumstance prejudicial, when it should naturally be favourable to the criminal.

In short, it is remarkable, that for the trial of a peer it was necessary to summon the peers, who were his natural judges. Charles VII. added the great officers of the crown in the affair of the duke of Alençon; nay, he did more, he admitted the treasurers of France with the lay deputies of the parliament. Thus every thing changes; so that the history of the customs, laws, and privileges, in a great many countries, and especially in France, is a picture that is constantly varying.

It is therefore an idle notion, and an ungrateful task, to think of reducing every thing to the ancient usages, and to want to fix that wheel which time revolves with irresistible motion. To what æra must we have recourse? To that when the word *parliament* signified an assembly of free captains, who met in the open fields on the first

first of March, to regulate the distribution of the spoils? Or to that when all the bishops had a right of sitting in a court of judicature, which likewise had the name of parliament? Or to the time when the barons kept the commons in a state of slavery? To what age, to what laws must we ascend, what custom must we abide by? A modern Roman might with as much reason insist upon the pope's re-establishing the consuls, the tribunes, the senate, the comitia, and the intire form of the ancient republic; or a modern Athenian might as well desire the sultan to restore the ancient Areopagus, and the assemblies of the people, which were stiled churches.

C H A P. LXXXVI.

Of the Council of Basil held at the Time of Charles VII. in the Fifteenth Century.

COUNCILS may be said to be the same thing to the popes, as the states general are to kings: but still there is constantly some difference even in things that bear the greatest resemblance. In limited monarchies, even where there is the greatest mixture of a republican spirit, the states have never fancied themselves above their kings, though they have often deposed them under particular emergencies, or during intestine troubles. The electors who deposed the emperor Wenceslaus never imagined themselves superior to a reigning emperor. The courts or states of Arragon used to tell the king whom they elected, *Nos que valemus tanto como vos, e que podemos mas que vos**; but after his coronation they ceased to express themselves in this kind of style; they no longer called themselves the superiors of a person whom they had made their master.

* Vide Chap. lxiv.

But

But it is not the same thing with an assembly of bishops of so many independent churches, as with the body of a monarchical state. This body has a sovereign; whereas the several churches have only a first metropolitan. Matters of religion, doctrine, and discipline, cannot be submitted to the decision of a single man in contempt of the whole world. Councils are therefore superior to popes, in the same sense as the opinion of a thousand persons ought to prevail over that of one. The question is to know, whether they have a right to depose him, as the diets of Poland, and the electors of the German empire have a right to depose their sovereign.

This is one of those questions which can be decided only by force. If, on the one hand, a simple provincial council may depose a bishop, surely an assembly of the whole Christian world may degrade the bishop of Rome. But, on the other hand, this bishop is a sovereign, an authority which he has not derived from any council: how then can a council deprive him of it, especially when his subjects are satisfied with his administration? It would be to no purpose for all the bishops of the universe to depose an elector, with whom the empire and his electorate were satisfied; he would still continue an elector, with the same right as a king excommunicated by the whole church, but master at home, would continue to be a sovereign.

The council of Constance deposed the sovereign of Rome, because the Romans were neither willing nor able to oppose it. The council of Basil, by attempting, ten years afterwards, to follow this example, shewed the world how easily we may be deceived by precedents, how great a difference there is in affairs which appear to be of the same nature, and how what is great and bold at one time, may be trifling and rash at another.

The council of Basil was only a prolongation of several others which had been summoned by pope Martin V. sometimes at Pavia, and sometimes at Sienna: but as soon as pope Eugenius VI. was elected,
in

in 1431, the fathers began with declaring, that the pope had neither a right to dissolve, nor even to transfer their assembly, and that he himself was subject to their jurisdiction. Upon this declaration pope Eugenius issued out a bull dissolving the council. The fathers, by this precipitate step, shewed more zeal than prudence; and their zeal might have been attended with fatal consequences. The emperor Sigismund, who still reigned, had not Eugenius's person in his power, as he had had John XXIII. so that he was obliged to behave with great circumspection as well towards the pope as towards the council. This scandalous affair was a long time confined to negotiations; and both the eastern and western churches were engaged in the cause. The Greek empire was no longer able to maintain itself against the Turks, but by the assistance of the Latin princes; and, in order to obtain a weak and very uncertain supply, the eastern church was required to submit to that of Rome. The Greeks were very far from being inclined to this submission; nay, as their danger approached, they rather grew more stubborn. But the emperor John Paleologus, whom the danger threatened more nearly, resolved politically to comply with what his whole clergy had refused through obstinacy. He was ready to agree to every thing, provided they would assist him: he addressed himself at the same time to the pope, and to the council, and they both contended who should have the honour of receiving the concessions of the Greeks. He sent ambassadors to Basil, where the pope had a few of his party, who were more artful than the rest of the fathers. The council had decreed that money should be sent to the emperor, with galleys to escort him to Italy; and that afterwards he should be received at Basil. The pope's emissaries made a surreptitious decree, by which it was ordained, in the name of the council itself, that the emperor should be received at Florence, whither the pope had transferred the assembly; they likewise broke the lock of the box where the council kept the seals; and thus they signed, in the

name of the fathers, the very contrary of what had been voted by that body. This Italian artifice succeeded, and it then clearly appeared that the pope must, in every respect, have the advantage.

The assembly had no chief that was able to keep them united, and to crush the pope as was the case in the council of Constance. They had no settled plan; they even behaved with so little prudence, that in a certain writing which they delivered to the Greek ambassadors, it was mentioned, that after destroying the heresy of the Hussites, they would extirpate the errors of the Greek church. The pope acted with greater cunning; he spoke to the Greeks of nothing but of union and brotherly love, and avoided all harsh expressions. He was a man, who had given proofs of great abilities, by appeasing the commotions at Rome, and by attaining to his present degree of power, in spite of such strong opposition: in short, his gallies were ready before those of the council.

The emperor having his expences defrayed by the pope, embarked with his patriarch and a few select bishops, who were ready to abjure the opinions of the Greek church to save their country. The pope received them at Ferrara, where the emperor and the bishops, notwithstanding their real submission, preserved the appearance of the majesty of the empire, and of the dignity of the Greek church. None of them kissed the pope's toe; but after some contests about the word *filioque*, which the church of Rome had long since inserted in the symbol, as also about unleavened bread, and purgatory, they reconciled themselves in every respect to the Roman church.

The pope removed his council from Ferrara to Florence, where the deputies of the Greek church embraced the opinion of purgatory. Here it was decided, "That the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and
" the Son by the production of inspiration; that the
" Father communicates every thing to the Son except-
" ing his paternity; and that the Son has had a pro-
" ductive virtue from all eternity."

In

In short, the Greek emperor, with his patriarch and almost all his prelates, subscribed at Florence to the long disputed point of the primacy of the bishop of Rome. The Byzantine history affirms, that the pope bribed them to sign this acknowledgement. This is not improbable; it was the pope's interest to gain this advantage at any price; and the bishops of a country, desolated by the Turks, must have been poor.

This union of the Latins and Greeks was indeed but of short duration. It was a farce played by the emperor John Paleologus. The whole Greek church disowned what had been done; and the bishops who had subscribed at Florence, asked pardon for their proceedings, at Constantinople, and acknowledged that they had betrayed the true faith. They were on this occasion compared to Judas, who betrayed his master, and were not re-admitted into the bosom of their church, till they had formally abjured the innovations with which the Latins were accused.

After this, the Latin and Greek churches were more divided than ever. The Greeks, always vain of their boasted antiquity, their first general councils and their sciences, increased in their hatred and contempt for the Romish communion. They baptized anew, all the Latins who came over to them; and from hence came the custom observed at St. Petersburg and Riga, of obliging a Roman catholic, who embraces the Greek religion, to undergo a second baptism. Several erased confirmation and extreme unction out of the number of the sacraments; and they were one and all against the procession of the Holy Ghost, purgatory, and the communicating in one kind only; and in fact, it is certain, that they differ as much from the church of Rome, as the protestants do. Nevertheless, pope Eugenius IV. was thought by the whole West to have extinguished this great schism. He had indeed brought the Greek emperor, and his church, under a seeming subjection; at any rate his victory was glorious, and there never had been a pope who seemed to have rendered a more

essential service to the Roman church, or to have enjoyed a more splendid triumph.

At the very time that he was rendering this service to the Latins, and that he extinguished, as much as he was able, the schism between the eastern and western
1439 churches, the council of Basil deposed him from the pontificate, declaring him guilty of *rebellion, simony, schism, heresy and perjury*.

If we consider the council by this decree, we shall find them to be an assembly of factious prelates; but if we view them by the rules of discipline which they established, they will appear to be men of consummate wisdom. This is because passion had no share in these regulations, whereas they were swayed by it entirely in the degrading of pope Eugenius. The most august body, when under the influence of faction, commit more mistakes than a single person. In France the council of Charles VII. embraced those prudent regulations, and rejected the decree which had been dictated by the spirit of party.

It was these regulations which long contributed to render the pragmatic sanction so dear to the French nation. That which had been promulged by St. Louis, could scarce be said to subsist; and the customs which had been in vain insisted upon by France, were abolished by the artifices of the court of Rome. By this famous pragmatic sanction the customs were restored; the elections made by the clergy with the king's approbation were confirmed; the annats were declared simoniacal; and the reserves and expectatory graces were condemned. But on the one hand, men seldom have the courage to exert their whole strength; and on the other, they sometimes exert their strength too much. This famous law which secures the liberties of the Gallican church, permits appeals to be made to the pope in the last resort, and that he should delegate judges in all ecclesiastic causes, which might be so easily determined by national bishops. This was in some measure acknowledging the pope as master: and at the very time that the pragmatic sanction left him possessed of
the

the first of all rights, they forbid him to create more than four and twenty cardinals, with as little reason as the pope would have to fix the number of the dukes and peers in France, or of the grandees in Spain. Thus mankind are made up of contradiction. It is true that the council of Basil was the first that attempted to impose such a restriction on the popes. They did not consider, that by lessening the number, they increased the power, and that the more rare any dignity is, the more it is respected.

It was likewise the discipline established by this council, that afterwards produced the Germanic concordate : but the pragmatic sanction has been abolished in France, whereas the Germanic concordate is still in force. All the usages of Germany have been preserved, such as the election of prelates, the investiture of princes, the privileges of cities, the rights, the ranks and order of precedencies ; hardly any thing has changed ; whereas, in France, we see not the least remains of the customs adopted in the reign of Charles VII.

After the council of Basil had vainly deposed a very prudent pope, whose authority all Europe continued to acknowledge, they set up, as every body knows, a mere phantom in his room, a duke of Savoy, named Amadeus VIII. who from being the first duke of his family, was now become an hermit at Ripaglia. Poggio does not think his devotion was real : this however is certain, that he could not withstand the ambition of being pope. He was declared supreme pontiff, though a layman : and that which had caused such a violent schism and such wars in the time of Pope Urban VI. was now productive only of ecclesiastical quarrels, bulls, censures, reciprocal excommunications, and contumelious expressions. For if on the one hand the council called Eugenius a simonist, an heretic, a perjurer ; on the other, Eugenius's secretary treated the fathers as fools, madmen and barbarians ; and to Amadeus he gave the name of *Cerberus*, and of *Antichrist*. In short, under pope Nicholas V. the council insensibly dwindled away of itself ; and this duke of Savoy, hermit and pope, contented

contented himself with a cardinal's hat, whereby the
 1449 church was restored to her usual tranquillity. This was
 the twenty-seventh and last considerable schism that has
 been raised for the possession of St. Peter's chair.
 Never has the throne of any kingdom been so often
 disputed.

Æneas Piccolomini, the Florentine poet and orator,
 who was secretary to this council, had written very
 violently in support of the superiority of councils over
 the popes; but afterwards when he was made pope
 himself, under the name of Pius II. he condemned,
 still more violently, his own writings, sacrificing every
 thing to the consideration of present interest, which alone
 so frequently establishes the principles of truth and false-
 hood. There were some other writings of his spread
 abroad. In the fifteenth letter of his collection, pub-
 lished under the name of *Amœnitates*, he recommends
 one of his bastards whom he had by an English woman.
 Hence we find, that he did not condemn his amours,
 as he had condemned his sentiments on the fallibility
 of the popes.

This council shews how greatly every thing varies,
 according to the difference of times. The fathers at
 the council of Constance condemned John Hufs and
 Jerome of Prague to the flames, notwithstanding the
 solemn protestation of these men, that they did not
 follow the dogmas of Wickcliff, and notwithstanding
 the clear explanation they gave of their faith concern-
 ing the real presence, persisting only in Wickcliff's
 sentiments in regard to the hierarchy and discipline of
 the church.

The Hussites, at the time of the council of Basil,
 went much further than the two founders of their sect.
 Procopius, that famous captain, who was the com-
 panion and successor of John Ziska, came and disputed
 in the council at the head of two hundred gentlemen
 of his party. Among other things he maintained,
that monks were invented by the devil. "Yes, said he, I
 will prove it. Is it not true that Jesus Christ instituted
 no order of this kind?" "We do not deny it, answered
 cardinal

cardinal Julian." "Well then, said Procopius, it is plain they were invented by the devil." A reasoning worthy of a Bohemian captain of those days. Æneas Piccolomini, who was present at this scene, tells us, that they answered Procopius only with a loud fit of laughter: but the unfortunate John Hufs and Jerome of Prague had been answered by a sentence of death.

During this council we have seen how greatly the Greek emperors debased themselves. They must surely have been upon the brink of ruin, when they cringed for such feeble succours to Rome, and made a sacrifice of their religion. In fact, they fell some years afterwards a victim to the Turks, who became masters of Constantinople. Let us now see what were the causes and consequences of this revolution.

C H A P. LXXXVII.

Of the Decline of the Greek Empire,—Its Weakness, Superstition, &c.

THE crusades, in depopulating the West, first opened the breach by which the Turks at length entered Constantinople; for the usurpation of the crusaders had weakened the oriental empire to such a degree, that the Greeks, upon recovering it out of their hands, found it dismembered and impoverished.

We should recollect that this empire returned to the Greeks in 1261; and that Michael Paleologus, after having rescued it from the Latin usurpers, dethroned his pupil, John Lascaris. We ought likewise to remember, that at that very time Charles of Anjou, brother to St. Louis, invaded Naples and Sicily, and that had it not been for the Sicilian vespers, he would have contested with the tyrant Paleologus, the sovereignty of Constantinople, a city fated to be a prey to usurpers.

This

This Michael Paleologus acted his part very artfully with the popes, in order to divert the storm: he flattered them with the submission of the Greek church; but his mean politics could not prevail over the spirit of party, nor over the superstition by which his country was influenced. By this kind of temporizing, he rendered himself so odious, that his own son Andronicus, unhappily a zealous schismatic, either durst
 1283 not, or would not grant him the honours of a Christian burial.

And yet these unhappy Greeks, thus pressed on every side, both by the Turks and by the Latins, were disputing all this time about the transfiguration of Jesus Christ. One half of the empire pretended that the light of Tabor was eternal, and the other that God had produced it merely on account of the transfiguration. A considerable sect of monks, and contemplative devotees, saw this light at their navels, in the same manner as the Indian Faquirs see the heavenly light at the end of their noses. In the mean time the Turks were acquiring strength in Asia Minor, and soon made themselves masters of Thrace.

Ottoman, from whom all the emperors of that name are descended, had fixed the seat of his empire at Byrsa in Bithynia. His son Orcan advanced to the borders of the Propontis. The emperor John Cantacuzenus was glad to give this prince his daughter in marriage: and the nuptials were celebrated at Scutari, opposite to Constantinople. Soon after, another competitor set up for the imperial diadem; when the emperor finding himself unable to maintain his authority, retired to a monastery. Such a circumstance as an emperor's being father-in-law to the Turkish sultan, and afterwards turning monk, seemed to forebode the downfall of the empire. The Turks, who at this time had no shipping, wanted to cross over into Europe. To so low an ebb was the empire reduced, that the Genoese, by paying a small acknowledgment, were in possession of Galata, which is looked upon as a suburb

of Constantinople, from whence it is parted by a canal which forms the port. We are told that sultan Amurath, son of Orcan, engaged the Genoese to transport his troops to the other side of the strait; the contract was signed; and the Genoese are supposed for some thousand besants of gold to have betrayed Europe. Others pretend that the Turks made use of Greek vessels. Be that as it may, Amurath passed the strait, and advanced as far as Adrianople, where the Turks made a settlement, and from thence threatened all Christendom. The emperor John Paleologus repaired¹³⁵⁷ in all haste to Rome to kiss the feet of pope Urban V. he there acknowledged his supremacy, and humbled himself in order to obtain some assistance by the pope's mediation: but the situation of their own affairs, and the unhappy example of the past crusades, hindered the European princes from thinking of any such expedition. At length, after having in vain endeavoured to move the pope, he went back and cringed to Amurath, with whom he concluded a treaty, not as one crowned head with another, but as a slave with his master. He served at the same time as a lieutenant and as an hostage to the Turkish conqueror; and after Amurath and Paleologus had each put out the eyes of¹³⁷⁴ their eldest sons, of whom they were equally jealous, Paleologus gave his second son to the sultan. This son, whose name was Manuel, served under Amurath against the Christians. The janizaries had been already instituted; but from Amurath they received the form of discipline which still subsists.

This prince was assassinated in the midst of his victories, and his son Bajazet Ilderim, or Bajazet the Thunderbolt, succeeded him. The Greek emperors were then at the very lowest ebb of ignominy and debasement. Andronicus, the unfortunate son of John Paleologus, who had his eyes plucked out by his own father, fled to Bajazet, and implored his protection against his father and his brother Manuel. Bajazet gave him four thousand horse; and the Genoese, who were still masters of Galata, assisted him with men and money. With

these succours Andronicus made himself master of Constantinople, where he put his father under close confinement.

At the end of two years the father resumed the purple, and caused a citadel to be built near Galata, in order to stop the progress of Bajazet, who already had projected the siege of the imperial city. Bajazet ordered him to demolish the citadel, and to admit a Turkish cadi into the town, to decide the causes of the Turkish merchants settled in that capital. The emperor obeyed; and Bajazet leaving Constantinople behind him, as a prey that he might at any time seize, advanced towards the heart of Hungary. There he defeated, as I have already mentioned, the Christian army, and among the rest those brave Frenchmen who were under the command of Sigismond emperor of the West. Before the battle the French slew their Turkish prisoners; so that it is not to be wondered that Bajazet after his victory massacred the French in his turn, who had set him this cruel example. He ordered only five and twenty knights to be saved, among whom was the count de Nevers, afterwards duke of Burgundy, to whom he said upon receiving his ransom; "*I might oblige thee to swear never more to take up arms against me, but I despise thy oaths and thy arms.*"

The duke of Burgundy was the same John *Sans peur*, or the *Fearless*, who assassinated the duke of Orleans, and was himself afterwards assassinated by Charles VII. and yet we boast ourselves more humane and civilized than the Turks!

After this defeat, Manuel Paleologus, who was now emperor of Constantinople, had recourse to the European princes, like his father John I. and his son John II. He came to France to sue for succour; but he never could have chosen a less favourable time, Charles VI. being seized with a frenzy, and his country a scene of desolation.

Manuel staid two years at Paris, while the capital of the Christians, in the East, was blocked up by the Turks. At length they laid siege to it in form,
and

and the loss of this celebrated metropolis seemed inevitable, when it was preserved for a while by one of those great revolutions which change the face of the earth.

The dominion of the Mogul Tartars, whose origin we have already seen, extended from the Volga to the frontiers of China and to the Ganges. Tamerlane, one of those Tartar princes, saved Constantinople by attacking Bajazet.

C H A P. LXXXVIII.

Of Tamerlane.

TIMUR-BEK, whom I shall call Tamerlane, in compliance with the general custom, was descended from Genghis-kan by the female side, according to the testimony of the best historians. He was born in 1357, in the town of Cash, situate in the ancient Sogdiana, where the Greeks formerly extended their arms under Alexander, and established some colonies. This is now the country of the Usbecks: it begins at the river Gihon or Oxus, which rises in the little Thibet, about seven hundred leagues from the source of the Tigris and the Euphrates. It is the same Gihon as that mentioned in Genesis, and which is there said to flow from the same source as the Euphrates and the Tigris.

Upon hearing the name of the town of Cash, some would imagine it to be a frightful country; and yet it is in the same climate as Naples and Provence, and is certainly a delightful situation.

People are apt to consider Tamerlane as a brutish barbarian: but it has been observed, that there never was any great conqueror among princes, nor great fortunes among private people, without that kind of merit which is rewarded with success. That Tamerlane was in a very high degree possessed of the merit which

accompanies ambition, appears from this, that though he was born to no title nor possessions, yet he subdued as large an extent of country as Alexander, and almost as much as Genghis-kan. His first conquest was that of Balch, the capital of Khorassan, on the frontiers of Persia. Then he made himself master of the province of Kandahor; and after reducing all the ancient Persia under his dominion, he turned back in order to conquer the people of Tranfoxana. Thence he marched to lay siege to Bagdad, which he took; and proceeding with his army into India, he subdued that nation, and entered Deli, the capital of the empire. We find that in all ages they who have made themselves masters of Persia, have also conquered or ravaged India. Thus Darius Ochus, after several others, made a conquest of it: Alexander, Genghis-kan, and Tamerlane, soon brought it under subjection; and in our days Shah Nadir only shewing himself in that country, immediately gave law to the inhabitants, and returned loaded with immense treasures.

After Tamerlane had made the conquest of India, he marched his army back, and falling upon Syria, he took Damascus. From thence he suddenly returned to Bagdad, which had been already subdued, but wanted now to shake off the yoke. He soon became master of it again, and delivered it up to the fury of the foldiers. Near eight hundred thousand inhabitants are said to have perished on this occasion; in short, the city was intirely destroyed. In those countries the towns were easily razed to the ground, and easily rebuilt; the houses, as we have already observed, being made only of brick dried in the sun. It was in the midst of these victories that the Greek emperor, finding no relief from the Christians, addressed himself to the Tartar conqueror. Five Mussulmen princes, whom Bajazet had dispossessed of their dominions on the Euxine sea, implored the assistance of Tamerlane at the same time. At length we find him marching his army into Asia Minor, at the request both of Mussulmen and Christians.

We

We may form a favourable idea of his character from this, that in the course of this war he observed at least the law of nations. He began with sending ambassadors to Bajazet, who were ordered to insist upon his raising the siege of Constantinople, and doing justice to the Mahometan princes whom he had stripped of their dominions. Bajazet received these proposals with anger and disdain. Tamerlane declared war against him, and immediately put his troops in motion. Bajazet raised the siege of Constantinople, and between Cæsarea and Ancyra was fought that famous battle where the forces of the whole world seemed to have been assembled. Doubtless Tamerlane's troops were well disciplined; since, after the most obstinate struggle, they defeated those who had overthrown the Greeks, the Hungarians, the Germans, the French, and so many other warlike nations. It is certain that Tamerlane, who had hitherto fought with the scimitar and with arrows, made use of artillery against the Turks; and that it was he who sent some field pieces into the Mogul's country, where they are still to be seen with unknown characters engraved upon them. The Turks, in this very engagement, made use not only of cannon but of the ancient wild-fire: by this double advantage they would infallibly have been masters of the field, if Tamerlane had had no artillery. 1409

Bajazet saw his eldest son Mustapha slain by his side in the engagement, and he himself fell into the hands of the enemy, together with another son of his, whose name was Musa or Moses. It is natural to inquire into the consequences of this battle betwixt two nations who seemed to dispute the empire of Europe and Asia, and between two conquerors whose names are still so famous in story; a battle moreover which saved the Greeks for a while, and might have helped to destroy the Turkish empire.

Not one of the Persian and Arabian authors who wrote the life of Tamerlane, takes notice of his shutting up Bajazet in an iron cage. But it is mentioned in the Turkish annals; perhaps in order to render
Tamerlane

Tamerlane odious; or rather because they copied it from Greek historians. The Arabian authors pretend that Tamerlane obliged Bajazet's wife, half naked, to wait upon him at table; and this is what gave birth to the vulgar error, that the Turkish sultans never would marry after such an affront done to one of their wives. This fable is refuted by the marriage of Amurath II. whom we shall find espousing the daughter of a despot of Servia; and by that of Mahomet II. to the daughter of a prince of Turcomania.

It is difficult to reconcile the iron cage, and the base affront done to Bajazet's wife, with the generosity which the Turks attribute to Tamerlane. They relate that this conqueror upon entering Bursa, or Prusa, the capital of the Turkish dominions in Asia, wrote a letter to Solyman, son of Bajazet, which would have done honour to Alexander. "I am willing to forget, says Tamerlane, that ever I was the enemy of Bajazet. I shall act as a father towards his children, provided they wait for the effects of my clemency. I am content with my conquests, and no new favours of fickle fortune shall ever tempt me."

Supposing that such a letter was ever written, it could be nothing but an artifice. The Turks likewise mention, that upon Solyman's taking no notice of the letter, that same Musa, son of Bajazet, was declared sultan in Bursa by Tamerlane, who said to him upon the occasion, "Receive the inheritance of thy father; a generous soul knows how to conquer kingdoms, and to restore them."

The oriental historians, as well as those of Europe, are apt to put words into the mouths of celebrated men which they never said. Such magnanimous behaviour towards the son does but ill agree with his barbarous treatment of the father. But what we may infer for certain, and indeed most deserves our attention, is, that the great victory obtained by Tamerlane did not deprive the Turkish empire of a single city. This Musa, whom he made sultan, and whom he protected against his brothers Solyman and Mahomet I.

was

was unable to oppose them, notwithstanding the protection of the conqueror. There was a civil war for thirteen years between the sons of Bajazet; and we do not find that Tamerlane derived any advantage from it. Even the misfortune of Bajazet is a proof that the Turks were altogether a warlike nation, who might lose battles without being conquered; and that the Tartar finding it not so easy to extend his conquests, or to make any settlements towards Asia Minor, turned his arms into other countries.

His pretended generosity to the sons of Bajazet, was not surely the effect of moderation. For soon after this we find him ravaging Syria, which was still subject to the Mamalukes of Egypt. From thence he repassed the Euphrates, and returned to Samarcand, which he considered as the capital of his vast dominions. He had conquered almost as great an extent of territory as Genghis-kan; for if the latter had part of China and Corea, the former was possessed of Syria, and the half of Asia Minor, which Genghis-kan was never able to subdue: he was likewise master of almost all Indostan, whereas Genghis-kan had only the northern provinces. Tamerlane was no sooner settled in the possession of this immense empire, than he began to meditate the conquest of China, at too advanced a period of life.

It was at Samarcand, that in imitation of Genghis-kan, he received the homage of several princes of Asia, and the embassies of many sovereigns. Not only the Greek emperor Manuel sent ambassadors to him, but likewise Henry III. king of Castile. Here he gave one of those feasts which resembled those of the first kings of Persia. All the orders of the state, and the several artificers passed in review, each with the ensigns of his profession. He married all his grandsons and grand-¹⁴⁰⁶daughters the same day: at length he died at a very advanced age, after having reigned thirty-six years, more fortunate by the length of his days and the success of his grand-children, than Alexander, to whom the eastern writers compare him; but in other respects
we

we shall find him far inferior to the Macedonian, if we consider that he was born among a barbarous people; and, like Genghis-kan, had destroyed a great many cities without building one: whereas Alexander, during a very short reign, and in the midst of his rapid conquests, built Alexandria and Scanderoon; re-established this very Samarcand, which was afterwards Tamerlane's imperial residence; built cities as far as the Indies; settled Greek colonies beyond the Oxus; sent the Babylonian observations into Greece; and changed the commerce of Asia, Europe, and Africa, by making Alexandria the general magazine. In these points, I think the character of Alexander is superior to that of Tamerlane, Genghis, or any of the other conquerors that have ever been compared to him.

In other respects, Tamerlane does not appear to me to have been of a more violent temper than Alexander. If I may be permitted to enliven the dismal events I am describing, and to mix the little with the great, I will mention what has been related by a Persian who was a cotemporary of this Prince. He says, "That as a famous Persian poet, named Hamedi Kermani, was bathing one day in the same bath with Tamerlane and several other courtiers, they happened to fall upon a humorous kind of diversion, which consisted in settling the value of each of the company in money. I rate you, says the poet to the great kan, at thirty aspers. The napkin I wipe myself with is worth that, answers the monarch. Ay, but replies Hamedi, I reckoned the napkin too." It is probable that a prince who permitted those innocent liberties, was not of a ferocious disposition; but it is possible also, that he might grow familiar with the little people, while he cut the throats of the great.

He was neither a Mussulman nor of the sect of the great Lama, but like the Chinese literati he acknowledged one only God, and in this expressed a mark of great sense, which even the most civilized nations have wanted. There was no superstitious practices to be seen, neither at his court, nor in his armies. He tolerated

literated alike the Mussulmen, the Lamists, the Bramins, the Guebres, the Jews, as well as those who are called idolaters. He even assisted, as he was passing over mount Libanus, at the religious ceremonies of the Maronite monks who lived on that mountain. His only weakness was that of giving credit to judicial astrology, a very general error, from which we ourselves are but lately recovered. He himself was a man of no learning, but he took care to have his grandchildren instructed in the sciences. The famous Olougbeg who succeeded him in the dominions of Transoxana, founded at Samarcand the first academy of sciences, made the measurement of the earth, and had a share in the composition of the astronomical tables which go by his name, resembling in this respect Alphonso, king of Castile, who flourished more than one hundred years before him. The grandeur of Samarcand is at present fallen, together with the sciences; and the whole country, now possessed by the Usbeck Tartars, is relapsed into barbarism: but another revolution will perhaps one day restore it again to its former glory.

His posterity still reigns in that part of India, called Mogulstan, a name derived from the Mogul Tartars under Genghis-kan, who preserved this conquest to the time of Tamerlane. Another branch of his family reigned in Persia, till a succeeding dynasty of Tartar princes of the faction of the *white sheep*, took possession of that kingdom in 1468. When we reflect that the Turks are also of a Tartar original, and that Attila was descended from these very people, this will help to corroborate what has been already mentioned in the present work, that almost the whole world has been conquered by the Tartars. And we have seen the reason of this: they had nothing to lose; they were more robust, and more inured to hardship than other nations. But since the eastern Tartars, after making a second conquest of China in the last century, have formed both China and their own country into one government; since the empire of Russia has been likewise enlarged and civilized; and, in a word, since the whole

earth has been thick set with ramparts lined with artillery, these great migrations are no longer to be dreaded. Polite nations are sheltered from the irruptions of those savages. All Tartary, except that called Chinese, at present contains only wretched hordes or tribes, who would be extremely fortunate in being conquered in their turn, were it not far preferable to be free than civilized.

C H A P. LXXXIX.

Continuation of the History of the Turks, and of the Greeks till the taking of Constantinople.

CONSTANTINOPLE was for a time secured from danger by Tamerlane's victory, but the successors of Bajazet soon re-established their empire. Tamerlane's conquests were chiefly in Persia, Syria, Armenia, and on the borders of Russia. The Turks recovered Asia Minor, and preserved their acquisitions in Europe. At that time there must have been a greater intercourse, and less aversion, than at present, between the Mahometans and the Christians. John Paleologus made no difficulty to marry his daughter to Orcad; and Amurath II. grandson of Bajazet, and son of Mahomet I. did not scruple to marry the daughter of a despot of Servia named Irene.

Amurath II. was one of those Turkish princes who contributed to the Ottoman grandeur: but he was convinced of the vanity of that very grandeur which he had increased by his arms. His only aim was retirement. It must have been a very extraordinary spectacle to see a Turkish philosopher abdicate the crown: this prince resigned it twice, and twice he was prevailed upon by his bashaws and janizaries to resume it.

John Paleologus went to Rome, and from thence to the council, which we mentioned to have been summoned by Eugenius IV. at Florence; there he disputed

about the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, while the Venetians, already maſters of part of Greece, were purchaſing Theſſalonica, and his dominions were almoſt intirely ſhared between the Chriſtians and the Mahometans. Amurath in the mean time took this very Theſſalonica juſt after it had been ſold. The Venetians imagined they could ſecure this territory, and defend Greece by a wall eight thouſand paces in length, according to the ancient practice which the Romans themſelves had adopted in the north of England. This might have been ſome defence againſt the inroads of a ſavage nation, but was of no uſe againſt the diſciplined army of the Turks. They demolished the wall, and puſhed their conqueſts on all ſides into Greece, Dalmatia, and Hungary.

The Hungarians had lately choſen Ladislaus IV. the young king of Poland, for their ſovereign. Amurath II. after having carried on the war for ſome years in Hungary, Thrace, and all the neighbouring countries, with various ſucceſs, at length concluded the moſt ſolemn peace that had ever been made between the Chriſtians and the Turks. Amurath and Ladislaus both ſwore to it, one by the Koran, and the other by the Goſpel. The Turk promiſed to make no further conqueſts; and even ſurrendered ſome of thoſe he had already made. At the ſame time the limits of the Ottoman poſſeſſions, as well as of Hungary and Venice, were ſettled. 1444

Cardinal Julian Ceſarini, the pope's legate in Germany, a man famous for perſecuting the party of John Huſs, for preſiding at the council of Baſil, and for the cruſade which he preached againſt the Turks, was the perſon who, by too blind a zeal, occaſioned the diſgrace and miſfortunes of the Chriſtians.

Scarce was the peace concluded, when the cardinal was for breaking it. He flattered himſelf that he had engaged the Venetians and the Genoefe to fit out a formidable fleet, and that the Greeks would awake from their lethargy, and make one deſperate puſh. The occaſion likewise was favourable, for it was juſt at the

the very time when Amurath II. on the faith of the above-mentioned treaty, had consecrated his days to retirement, and resigned the empire to his son Mahomet, who was young and unexperienced.

A pretext was wanting for the violation of this oath: Amurath had observed all the conditions with a scrupulous exactness, which left not the least room for the Christians to complain. The legate then had no other resource than to persuade Ladislaus, as well as the Hungarian chiefs, and the Poles, that their oath was not binding. He assured them both in his speeches and his writings, that the peace sworn upon the gospel was void, because it had been made contrary to the pope's inclination. And indeed Eugenius IV. who was at that time pope, wrote to Ladislaus, ordering him *to break a peace which he had no authority to make without the consent of the holy see.* We have already seen that the maxim had been introduced, *of not keeping faith with heretics*; from whence they concluded, that they were not obliged to keep it with Mahometans.

Thus it was that ancient Rome violated the truce with Carthage in the last Punic war: but the event proved very different. The senate wantonly broke their engagements, from a desire of crushing a conquered republic; whereas the Christians were perfidious from a desire of repelling a nation of usurpers. At length the cardinal prevailed, and the several generals and chiefs were carried away by the torrent, especially John Corvin Hunniades, that famous general of the Hungarian armies, who fought so many battles against Amurath and Mahomet II.

Ladislaus, seduced by vain hopes, and by a doctrine which success alone could excuse, invaded the Turkish territories. The janizaries addressed themselves to Amurath, entreating him to quit his solitude, and to put himself at their head. The sultan having consented, the two armies met towards the Euxine sea, in that country which is now called Bulgaria, formerly Mæsia. The battle was fought in the neighbourhood
 1444 of the town of Varna. Amurath carried in his bosom the

the treaty of peace, which had been but just concluded; in the midst of the engagement, at the very time when his troops were giving way, he drew it out, and begged of God, the punisher of perjurers, to avenge this outrageous violation of the law of nations. This is what gave occasion to the fable, that the peace had been sworn to upon the eucharist, that the host had been delivered into the hands of Amurath, and that it was to this host he directed his speech in the heat of the battle. Perjury for this once received the punishment it deserved; the Christians, after an obstinate resistance, were intirely defeated. Ladislaus having been slain in the engagement, a janizary cut off his head, and carried it in triumph, from rank to rank, through the Turkish army; a spectacle which completed the victory.

Amurath, after gaining the victory, ordered the body of Ladislaus to be interred in the field of battle with all military solemnity. It is said also that he erected a monument upon his grave, and that the inscription, far from insulting the memory of the vanquished prince, extolled his courage, and lamented his misfortune.

Some writers say, that cardinal Julian, who had been present at this engagement, was drowned by the weight of the gold he had about him, in attempting to cross a river in his flight. Others affirm, that he was killed by the Hungarians themselves; it is certain however, that he perished on this fatal day.

But what is most remarkable, Amurath, after this victory, returned to his solitude, abdicating the crown a second time, which a second time he was obliged to resume, in order to fight and conquer. At length he died at Adrianople, and left the empire to his son Mahomet II. who was more anxious to imitate his father's valour than his philosophy.

C H A P. XC.

Of Scanderberg.

ANOTHER no less celebrated warrior, whom I know not whether to call a Turk or a Christian, stopped the progress of Amurath; and for a long time defended Christendom against the victorious arms of Mahomet II. I mean to speak of Scanderberg, who was born in Albania, a part of Epirus, a country famous in those old times which are called heroic, and in the real heroic times of the Romans. His real name was John Castriot; and he was son of a despot, or of a little king of that country; that is, of a prince who was a vassal at the same time; for this is implied by the word *despot*, which taken literally signifies the master of a house; and it is extraordinary that the appellation of *despotic* should have been since given to potent sovereigns, who have made themselves absolute in their dominions.

John Castriot was yet an infant many years before the above-mentioned battle of Varna, when Amurath seized on Albania, after the decease of Castriot's father, and brought up this infant, the youngest of four brothers. The Turkish annals make no mention of these four princes having been sacrificed to the vindictive spirit of Amurath. And indeed it does not appear that these barbarities were consistent with the character of a sultan who twice had abdicated the crown; nor is it probable that he could have so tenderly loved and confided in a person, from whom he ought to have expected the most implacable aversion. He was greatly attached to young Castriot, and, in battle, constantly kept him near his own person. On the other hand, Castriot shewed such signal marks of prowess, that the sultan and the janizaries gave him the name of *Scanderberg*, which signifies *Lord Alexander*.

At length friendship prevailed over good policy. Amurath entrusted him with the command of a small army

army against the despot of Servia, who had declared in favour of the Christians, and was waging war against his son-in-law the sultan. This happened before his abdication. Scanderberg, who was not then twenty years old, formed the design of throwing off his dependency, and of attaining the sovereign power.

Having had intelligence that a secretary, who carried the sultan's seals, was passing near his camp, he ordered him to be arrested and imprisoned; after which he forced him to sign an order to the governor of Croia, the capital of Epirus, to deliver up the town and citadel to Scanderberg. When he had dispatched this order, he assassinated the secretary and his attendants. He then marched to Croia, and the governor resigned the command to him without any difficulty. That very night the Albanians, with whom he kept a correspondence, advanced to the gates of the city, and assisted him in putting the governor, and the whole Turkish garrison to the sword. After this exploit, the whole province of Albania, by means of his adherents, was soon brought over to his interests. The Albanians are reckoned the best soldiers in that part of the world. Scanderberg disciplined them so well, and posted himself so advantageously in that rough and mountainous country, that with a few troops he stopped the progress of large armies of the Turks. The Mahometans looked upon him as a traitor, while the Christians admired him as a hero, who in deceiving his enemies and his masters, had recovered his father's crown, which he merited by his bravery.

C H A P. XCI.

Of the taking of Constantinople by the Turks.

IF the Greek emperors had been such men as Scanderberg, the eastern empire would have been preserved. But that very spirit of cruelty, weakness,

ness, division, and superstition, which had so long shaken its foundation, hastened now the moment of its destruction.

At that time they reckoned three empires of the east, when in reality there was not one. The first of these imaginary empires was the city of Constantinople, then in the hands of the Greeks. Adrianople, the asylum of the family of the Lascaris, which had been taken by Amurath I. in 1362, and ever since continued in the possession of the sultans, was looked upon as the second; and a barbarous province of the ancient Colchis, named Trebizond, which had been the retreat of the Comneni, was reputed the third.

This dismembering the empire was the only considerable effect of the crusades. After it had been ravaged by the Franks, it was recovered again by its ancient masters, but recovered to be once more exposed to depredations; so that it was amazing it subsisted so long. There were two parties in Constantinople, both most virulently inflamed against each other, by the disputes about religion; in the same manner almost as had been the case at Jerusalem, when besieged by Vespasian and Titus. One of these parties was that of the emperors, who, from the vain hopes of receiving succours, consented to subject the Greek to the Latin church; the other that of the priests and of the people, who having the invasion of the crusaders still fresh in their memories, detested the re-union of the two churches. Thus they wasted their time in religious controversies, while the Turks were at the city gates.

John II. Paleologus, the same who had humbled himself to the pope in the vain hope of procuring succour, had reigned twenty-seven years; and to such a low ebb was the empire reduced after his death, which happened in 1449, that Constantine, one of his sons, was obliged to receive from the Turkish sultan, Amurath II. as from his sovereign, a confirmation of the imperial dignity. One of the brothers of this Constantine had Lacedæmon, another was possessed of Corinth,

Corinth, and a third had that part of the Peloponnesus which was not subject to the Venetians.

Such was the situation of the Greeks, when Mahomet ¹⁴⁵¹ Bouyouk, or Mahomet the Great, succeeded the second time to his father sultan Amurath. The monkish writers have painted this prince as a brutish barbarian, who at one time cut off the head of his pretended mistress Irene to pacify the murmuring of his janizaries; and at another time ripped open the bellies of fourteen of his pages, to see which of them had eaten a melon. We likewise find these absurd stories in our dictionaries, which for this long time have been no more than the alphabetical repositories of falsehood.

All the Turkish annals inform us, that Mahomet had the best education of any prince in his time. What we have mentioned concerning his father Amurath, sufficiently proves that the latter had not neglected the instruction of his son and heir. Nor can it be denied, that Mahomet had a high sense of filial duty, and stifled all sentiments of ambition, when he gave back the crown which Amurath had resigned to him. Twice he returned to the condition of a private subject, without exciting the least disturbance. This is the only example of the kind recorded in history; and it is so much the more extraordinary, as the violence of Mahomet's temper was in every respect equal to his ambition.

He spoke Greek, Arabic, and Persian; he likewise understood Latin, and drawing, and knew all that could be then known of geography and the mathematics. He was particularly fond of painting, inasmuch that he sent to Venice, as every lover of the arts must have heard, for the famous Gentili Bellino, and rewarded him, as Alexander rewarded Apelles, with presents, and with his friendship. He gave him a crown of gold, and a gold collar, besides three thousand ducats, and sent him back with honour. I cannot help reckoning among improbable stories, that of the slave, whom Mahomet is pretended to have beheaded, in order to shew Bellino the effect of the

muscles, and of the skin, on a neck severed from the body. These barbarities which we exercise on animals, are never practised by men upon their own species, except in the fury of their vengeance, and in what is commonly called the right of war. Mahomet II. was oftentimes bloody and ferocious, as all conquerors are that have ravaged the world. But why should we charge him with such improbable cruelties? And to what purpose should we multiply these scenes of horror?

Philip de Comines, who lived at the time of this sultan, acknowledges that on his death bed he asked pardon of God for having imposed a tax on his subjects. Where shall we find an instance of a similar repentance in a Christian prince?

Mahomet was twenty-two years of age when he ascended the throne of the sultans; from that time he bent his mind on the conquest of Constantinople, while this unhappy city was rent into factions, disputing whether they should make use of leavened or unleavened bread in the sacrament, and whether it was best to pray in Greek or Latin.

The sultan began therefore with blockading this city on the side of Europe, and towards Asia. At length, in the beginning of April, 1453, the adjacent country was covered with an army, which historians, who are too apt to exaggerate, assure us amounted to three hundred thousand Turks, while the strait of Propontis was filled with about three hundred galleys and two hundred smaller vessels.

One of the most extraordinary, and yet best attested facts, is the use which Mahomet made of those ships. They could not get into the port, the mouth being barricadoed with strong chains of iron, and besides, in all probability advantageously defended. One night therefore he ordered the ground to be covered the length of two leagues with planks, which were greased with tallow, and laid like the manger of a ship; then, by means of certain engines, fourscore galleys and seventy smaller vessels were drawn from the strait, and conveyed

conveyed over land. All this was performed in one night, and the besieged were astonished early the next morning to see an entire fleet descend from the land into their harbour. The same day a bridge of boats was built within sight of them, and served for erecting a battery of cannon.

The city of Constantinople must either have had very little artillery, or this artillery must have been ill served. For how comes it that the cannon did not demolish this bridge of boats? But I question much, whether Mahomet, as they pretend, made use of two hundred pounders. It is common for the conquered to exaggerate every thing. There must have been near one hundred pounds of powder for the explosion of balls of that magnitude. This quantity of powder cannot take fire at once; the shot would go off before the fifteenth part had taken fire; and the ball would have but very little effect. Perhaps the Turks made use of such cannon through ignorance; and the Greeks might have been frightened also from the same cause.

In the month of May, the Turks made a general assault upon this city, considered by its inhabitants as the capital of the world. It was but indifferently fortified, and not much better defended. The emperor, attended by a Roman cardinal, named Isidore, conformed, or pretended to conform to the Romish ritual, with a view to engage the pope and the Catholic princes in his interest; but this served only to incense and dishearten his Greek subjects, who would not so much as enter the churches which he frequented; *We had rather, said they, see a turban here than a cardinal's hat.*

At other times, almost all the Christian princes, under the pretence of a holy war, entered into a league to invade this metropolis and bulwark of Christendom; and now when it was attacked by the Turks, not one of them appeared to defend it.

The emperor Frederick III. had neither power nor courage sufficient for such an enterprize. Poland was under too bad a government: France was scarcely rescued from that abyfs of misery into which its civil

diffensions, and the war with the English had plunged it. England began to feel the weakness arising from domestic divisions. Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy, was indeed a potent prince, but had too much sagacity to renew the crusades by himself, and besides was too far advanced in years to enter upon such an expedition. The Italian princes were at war with one another. Arragon and Castile were not yet united; and the Mahometans still possessed a part of Spain.

There were only two princes in Europe, qualified for entering the lists with Mahomet II. One was Hunniades, prince of Transylvania; but who was hardly able at that time to defend his own country. The other was the famous Scanderberg, who could only maintain his ground in the mountains of Epirus, in the same manner very near as don Pelagius defended himself formerly in the mountains of Asturia, when the Mahometans subdued Spain. Four Genoese ships, one of which belonged to the emperor Frederick III. were the only succour almost which the Christian world lent to Constantinople. A foreigner commanded in the town, whose name was Justiniani, a native of Genoa. Every building reduced to external support threatens ruin. The ancient Greeks never had a Persian at their head; nor were the troops of the republic of Rome ever commanded by a Gaul. Constantinople, thus situated, could not avoid being taken; and accordingly it was taken, but in quite a different manner from that related by all our authors, who have only copied Ducas and Chalcondylas.

In the Turkish annals digested at Constantinople, by the late prince Demetrius Cantemir, it is related, that after a forty-nine days siege, the emperor Constantine was obliged to capitulate. He sent several Greeks to receive the law of the conqueror, and they agreed upon many articles. The Turkish annals appear to be very true in what they relate of this siege of Constantinople. Ducas himself, who is thought to have been of the imperial race, and who during his infancy was in the besieged city, acknowledges in his history, that
the

the sultan offered to give the emperor Constantine, Peloponesus for himself, and to grant him some small provinces for his brothers. Mahomet wanted to have possession of the city, without sacking it, as he looked upon it as a part of his property, which he was willing to have safe; but just as the Greek deputies were returning back to the city, Mahomet recollecting something which he had still further to say, ordered his people to ride after them. The besieged beholding, from the top of the ramparts, a body of Turks galloping after the deputies, imprudently fired at them. The Turks were soon joined by a greater number. The Greek envoys were already entering by a postern, when the enemy entered pell-mell along with them, and made themselves masters of the upper town, which is separated from the lower. The emperor was killed in the crowd, and Mahomet immediately converted the palace of Constantine the Great into a seraglio, and St. Sophia into his principal mosque.

It is impossible to read without a mixture of pity and indignation the following passage in Ducas, in which he tells us that the sultan, "Ordered fires to be lighted in every part of his camp; which was accordingly done, and accompanied with the impious cry which is the particular sign of their horrid superstition." This impious cry alluded to by Ducas was no other than the word *Allah*, which signifies God, whom the Mahometans constantly invoke in all their battles. The charge of superstition was applicable, not to the Turks, but to the Greeks, who took shelter in the church of St. Sophia, on the faith of a prediction which assured them that an angel would descend into the church to defend them.

Some of the Greeks were killed in the church porch; the rest were made slaves. Mahomet did not go to return thanks to the Deity in this church till it had been washed with rose-water.

Having thus made himself master of one half of Constantinople by the right of conquest, he had the humanity, or the good policy to grant the same capitulation

tulation to the other half as he had offered to the whole city ; and he religiously observed it. This is so far true, that all the Christian churches of the lower town were preserved till the reign of his grandson Selim, who ordered many of them to be demolished. They were called the *mosques of Issévi*, which is the Turkish name for *Jesus*. That of the Greek patriarch still subsists at Constantinople, on the canal of the Black sea. The Turks have permitted an academy to be founded in this quarter, where there are professors to teach the ancient Greek, which is no longer a living language, as also Aristotle's philosophy, theology, and physic ; this is the school that formed Constantine Duca, Mauro Cordato, and Cantemir, whom the Turks made princes of Moldavia. I own that Demetrius Cantemir has related a great many idle fables, but he could not be mistaken in regard to the modern institutions which he saw himself, nor to the academy where he was educated.

The Christians still preserve a church, and an entire street in Constantinople, in consequence of a grant made to a Greek architect, named Christobulus. This architect had been employed by Mahomet II. to build a mosque on the ruins of *the church of the holy Apostles*, an ancient work of Theodora, wife of the emperor Justinian ; and he succeeded in erecting an edifice not much inferior to St. Sophia in beauty. He built likewise, by Mahomet's orders, eight schools, and eight hospitals, dependent on this mosque ; and it was to reward this service that the sultan granted him the street I mentioned, which still remains in his family. It is not a fact worthy of history, that an architect should have the property of a street ; but it is important to know that the Turks do not always treat the Christians as barbarously as we imagine. No Christian nation will suffer the Turks to have a mosque in it ; and yet the Turks give leave to the Greeks to have churches amongst them. Several of these churches are collegiate, and in the Archipelago we see canons under the dominion of a bashaw. Whole nations are deceived by his-
torical

torical errors. A number of western writers have pretended, that the Mahometans worshipped Venus, and denied Providence. Even Grotius himself tells us more than once, that Mahomet, that great but false prophet, had taught a pigeon to fly towards his ear, and made people believe that the Divine Spirit instructed him under that form. A multitude of stories, all equally ridiculous, have been related of the conqueror Mahomet II.

It evidently appears however, notwithstanding the declamation of cardinal Isidore, and of so many others, that Mahomet was a prince of greater moderation and politer accomplishments than we are willing to believe, by his permitting the conquered Christians to chuse their patriarch. He installed him himself with the usual solemnity; and gave him the crozier and ring which the western emperors had long since been afraid to give. If in any thing he deviated from the usual ceremony, it was to reconduct the elected patriarch Gennadius to the gates of his palace; when the patriarch told him, "That he was quite ashamed of an honour which none of the Christian emperors had done to his predecessors." Some authors have had the weakness to relate, that Mahomet II. said to this patriarch, "The holy Trinity makes thee, by the authority which I received, œcumenical patriarch." These writers know but very little of the Mussulmen, and are ignorant that our doctrine of the Trinity is held by them in the utmost abhorrence, insomuch that they think themselves defiled by only pronouncing the word, and that they look upon us as idolaters, who worship many gods. Since that time the Turkish sultans have constantly appointed a patriarch, who is called œcumenical. The pope nominates another, who is stiled the Latin patriarch; each of them is taxed by the divan, and the tax is paid by their miserable flock. These two churches equally groaning under oppression, are nevertheless irreconcilable; and to pacify their quarrels, is at present a considerable task of the sultans, who

who are become moderators as well as conquerors of the Christians.

These conquerors did not behave in the same manner towards the Greeks, as they behaved heretofore, that is, in the tenth and eleventh centuries, towards the Arabians, whose language, manners, and religion they adopted. At the time the Turks subdued the Arabians, they were mere barbarians; but when they conquered the Greek empire, the constitution of their government had been long settled. They had respected the Arabians, but they despised the Greeks; hence they have had no other intercourse with the latter, than that which takes place between masters and their slaves.

They have retained all the same customs and laws as they had at the time of making their conquests. The militia of Gengi-Cheris, whom we call janizaries, subsisted then in full vigour, and in the same number as at present; that is, about forty-five thousand. Of all the soldiers upon the face of the earth, these are the best fed. Each oda of janizaries has a purveyor, who supplies them with mutton, rice, butter, pulse, and bread in plenty.

The sultans have preserved in Europe the ancient custom which they followed before in Asia, of bestowing fiefs for life, and some of them hereditary, upon their troops. They did not borrow this custom from the caliphs, whom they dethroned. The Arabian government was founded on different principles. The western Tartars used always to divide the conquered lands. So early as the fifth century they had made this regulation in Europe; a regulation that unites the victors to a government which is become their inheritance; and the nations that intermixed with them, as the Lombards, the Franks and the Normans, followed this plan. Tamerlane carried it into India, where, to this very day, are the greatest lords of fiefs, under the different names of Omras, Rajas and Nabobs. But the Turks never gave large estates. Their Zaimats, and their Timariots, are rather farms than lordships.

This institution plainly shews the military spirit. If a Zaim is slain in battle, his children share his fief; if he dies a natural death, the Beglerbeg, that is, the general of the troops of the province, may nominate to this military benefice. These Zaims and Timars have no other privilege than that of leading soldiers to the field, as was heretofore the custom of the Franks; they have no titles, jurisdiction, or nobility.

From these same schools the Turks have always drawn the Cadis, the Mollas, who are their ordinary judges, and the two Cadi-Leskers of Asia and Europe, who are judges of the provinces, and of the armies; and who, under the Muphti, have the direction of religion and laws. The Muphti and the Cadi-Leskers have been ever subject to the divan. The Dervis, who are the same as mendicant friars with us, have multiplied and never varied. The custom of erecting caravanseras for travellers, with schools and hospitals near all their mosques, has never degenerated. In a word, the Turks are still what they were, not only at the taking of Constantinople, but when they first invaded Europe.

C H A P. XCII.

Of the Enterprises of Mahomet II. and his Death.

MAHOMET II. during a reign of one-and-thirty years, proceeded from conquest to conquest, without any of the Christian princes forming a league against him; for we must not give the name of *league* to a very short understanding between Hunniades prince of Transylvania, the king of Hungary, and a despot of black Russia. This celebrated Hunniades gave convincing proofs that if he had been better assisted, the Christians would not have been stripped of all those countries which the Mahometans now possess in Eu-

rope. He repulsed Mahomet II. from before Belgrade, three years after the taking of Constantinople.

About that time the Persians fell upon the Turks, and diverted the torrent with which Christendom was overwhelmed. Ussum Cassan, of the branch of Tamerlane, called the *White Ram*, and governor of Armenia, had lately subdued Persia. He formed an alliance with the Christians, and thus gave them a hint to unite against the common enemy: for he married the daughter of David Comnenus, emperor of Trebisond. The Christians were not allowed to marry their godmothers, or cousins: and yet we find, that in Greece, Spain and Asia, they made no scruple of intermarrying with Mussulmen.

The Tartar Ussum Cassan, son-in-law of the Christian emperor David Comnenus, attacked Mahomet on the banks of the Euphrates. This was a favourable opportunity for the Christians; and yet it was also neglected. They suffered Mahomet, after various success, to conclude a peace with the Persian; to take Trebisond, with part of Cappadocia that depended on it; to turn his arms against Greece; to seize on Negropont; to return to the extremity of the Black sea; to make himself master of Caffa, the ancient Theodosia rebuilt by the Genoese; to return and reduce Scutari, Zante and Cephalonia; to make inroads up to Trieste, at the very gates of Venice; and, at length, to establish the Mahometan power in the middle of Calabria, where he menaced the rest of Italy, and from whence his generals did not withdraw till after his decease.

His fortune failed him before Rhodes. The knights, who are now called the knights of Malta, had as well as Scanderberg the honour of repelling the victorious arms of Mahomet II.

It was in the year 1480 that this conqueror attacked that island, formerly so famous, and its city, which was founded a very considerable time before ancient Rome, in the most fertile spot, and under the most delicious climate; a city which had been governed by the children of Hercules, by Danaus, and by Cadmus,
and

and was famous throughout the whole world for its brazen colossus, dedicated to the sun. This immense work was cast in brass by an Indian; it was an hundred feet high, and under its legs, each of which rested on a spacious mole of marble, the loftiest ships could sail in and out of the harbour. Rhodes had fallen under the power of the Saracens about the middle of the seventh century; a French knight named Foulques de Villaret, grand master of the order, took it from them again in 1310; and another French knight, Peter d'Aubusson, defended it against the Turks.

It is something very remarkable, that Mahomet II. employed a great number of renegado Christians in this expedition. The grand visir himself, who laid siege to the place, was a Christian; and what is more strange of the imperial house of the Paleologi. One George Frupan, another Christian, had the direction of the works under the grand visirs orders. We never find an instance of Mussulmen changing their religion, and serving in the Christian armies. But whence this difference? Is it, that a religion, for whose sake they have parted with a portion of their own flesh, and which they have sealed with their own blood, in a most painful operation, is for that reason more dear to them? Is it that the Asiatic conquerors had more respect shewn them than the European powers? Or lastly, is it that in the times of ignorance, the arms of Mussulmen were thought to be more favoured of God, than those of Christians, and that hence they inferred the successful cause to be the best?

Peter d'Aubusson at this time however made the Christian cause triumphant, by obliging the grand visir, Messith Paleologus to raise the siege at the end of three months. Chalcondylas tells us, in his history of the Turks, that as the besiegers were mounting the breach, they beheld a golden cross in the air encircled with a glory, and a most beautiful woman robed in white; that struck with this miraculous appearance, they threw down their arms and took to flight. It seems however more probable that the Turks would

have been rather stimulated than intimidated at the sight of a beautiful woman; and that in fact the bravery of Peter d'Aubuffon and his knights, was the only miracle that obliged the Turks to give way. But this is the usual manner of writing among the modern Greeks.

Although Mahomet missed taking this little island, still the rest of the western world were not the less struck with the terror of his arms. He had conquered Epirus long before this, after the death of Scanderberg; when the Venetians had the courage to oppose his arms. This was the æra of the Venetian power; they had a considerable extent of territory on the continent, while their fleets bid defiance to the naval power of Mahomet, and made the conquest of Athens. But, at length, this republic receiving no succours, was obliged to give up Athens, and moreover to purchase, by an annual tribute, the liberty of trading to the Black sea, imagining thus to repair her losses by commerce, which had laid the foundation of her grandeur. We shall see that soon after, pope Julius II. and almost all the Christian princes, did more mischief to this republic, than it had suffered from the Ottomans.

In the mean while Mahomet II. was preparing to carry his victorious arms against the Mamalukes of Egypt, at the time that his generals were still in the kingdom of Naples: he flattered himself that afterwards he should be able to take Rome as easily as he had taken Constantinople; and hearing mention made of the ceremony with which the doge of Venice marries the Adriatic, he observed, "That he would soon send him to the bottom of that sea to consummate his marriage." At length a colic put a stop to the progress and designs of this conqueror. He died at Nicomedia at the age of fifty-one, just as he was preparing to renew the siege of Rhodes, and to march a formidable army into Italy.

C H A P. XCIII.

State of Greece under the Turkish Yoke.—Of the Government and Manners of the Turks.

ITALY had reason to consider the death of Mahomet II. as a fortunate event, but the Turks have nevertheless preserved a more extensive and more beautiful territory in Europe, than all Italy. The country of the Miltiades, the Leonidas's, the Alexanders, the Sophocles, and the Platos, soon relapsed into barbarism. The Greek language from that time was corrupted; and there scarce remained the least vestige of the liberal arts: for though there is a Greek academy at Constantinople, yet it is certainly not comparable to that of Athens; neither have the arts been re-established by the six thousand monks whom the Turks permit to live on mount Athos. Formerly that very same Constantinople was under the protection of Athens; and Chalcedon paid tribute to it. The king of Thrace courted the honour of being ranked as one of her citizens. But now, the descendants of the Tartars lord it over that fine country, while the name of Greece can hardly be said to subsist. Yet the little town of Athens will be ever more celebrated with us, than the Turks her oppressors, were they even to be lords of the universe.

Most of the stately monumens of Athens, which the Romans imitated, without being able to surpass, are either fallen to decay or totally lost; a little mosque is now built where the tomb of Themistocles stood; as we see a chapel of the Recollects built upon the ruins of the capitol of Rome. The ancient temple of Minerva is also converted into a mosque. The Piræan haven is no more. An antique lion of marble is still left standing near it, and gives its name to the harbour of Porto Leone, which is little better than a heap of rubbish. The spot where formerly stood the academy, is

is now covered with a few gardeners huts. The beautiful remains of the Stadion still inspire veneration and regret, and the temple of Ceres, which has escaped the injury of time, gives us a glimpse of what Athens formerly was. This city, which conquered Xerxes, contains between sixteen and seventeen thousand inhabitants, who tremble beneath the power of twelve hundred janizaries, who carry nothing but a white wand in their hands. The Spartans, the ancient rivals and conquerors of Athens, are confounded in the general subjection. They long struggled for their liberty, and still seem to retain somewhat of that ferocity and haughtiness of manners with which Lycurgus inspired them.

The Greeks remained in a state of oppression, though not of slavery. They were suffered to retain their religion and their laws; on which occasion the behaviour of the Turks was, similar to that of the Arabians in Spain. The Greek families continue in their country, disgraced and despised, but unmolested; they pay only a small tribute, carry on a trifling commerce, and cultivate the lands; their cities and their towns have still their *protogeros* who decides their disputes; and they allow an honourable support to their patriarch. This prelate must certainly draw very considerable sums from them, since he pays, at his installation four thousand ducats to the treasury of the empire, and as many more to the officers of the Port.

The greatest subjection the Greeks are under, is the obligation of supplying the sultan, by way of tribute, with a number of children, to serve in the seraglio, or among the janizaries. A father of a family is compelled to give one of his sons, or to ransom him. There are Christian provinces in Europe, where the custom obtains of appointing children for the army from their very cradle. These children of tribute, educated by the Turks, have often made great fortunes in the seraglio. Even the condition of janizaries is tolerable. It is a great proof of the force of education, and of the strange constitution of human affairs, that
most

most of those proud enemies of Christianity should be born of Christian parents. It was still a greater proof of the irresistible fatality by which the Supreme Being connects the several events of this world, that Constantinople should have been built by Constantine for the Turks; as the foundation of the capitol had been laid so many ages before by Romulus for the Roman pontiffs.

Here I think it incumbent upon me to combat a vulgar error, that the Turks live under an absurd kind of government, called *despotic*; that the people are all slaves to the sultan; that they have no sort of property; but that their lives and estates belong to their master. Such a government would destroy itself. Besides, it would be very extraordinary, that the conquered Greeks should be free, and their conquerors slaves. Some travellers imagine, that the lands all belong to the sultan, because he makes timariots for life, as formerly the kings of the Franks granted military benefices. These writers should have considered, that there are laws of inheritance in Turkey, as in every other country. The Alcoran, which is their civil as well as religious law, does, in the fourth chapter, provide for the inheritance of the sons and daughters, and the traditional law and established custom supplies whatever is not expressed in the Alcoran.

It is true, that the personal estates of the bashaws devolve to the sultan at their decease, and that he gives what part he pleases to the family. But this was a custom established in Europe when the fiefs were not hereditary; and a long time after, even the bishops themselves inherited the personal estates of the inferior clergy, while the popes exercised this right over the cardinals, and over all the incumbents who died within the residence of the supreme pontiff.

The Turks are not only free, but they have no distinction of nobility among them; they know no other superiority but that of employments.

In their manners they are fierce and haughty, and at the same time effeminate: their fierceness they derive
I from

from the Scythians their ancestors, and their softness from Greece and Asia. Their pride is excessive: they are conquerors and ignorant; which is the cause of their despising all other nations.

The Ottoman empire is not a monarchical government, tempered by mildness and moderation, like those of France and Spain; much less does it resemble Germany, a republic of princes and of towns, under a supreme head who has the title of emperor. It is in no respect like Poland, where the husbandmen are slaves and the nobles are kings: and it is as different from England in constitution as in climate. Yet we must not imagine, that it is in every respect an arbitrary government, where the law allows a single person to sacrifice a multitude of men to his caprice, like so many deer kept for his pleasure.

Our prejudices are such that we fancy a Chiaus, or officer of the sultan, can, staff in hand, command all the housekeepers of a town, in the sultan's name, to deliver up their money and their daughters for the use of his master. There are doubtless horrid abuses in the Turkish government, but, generally speaking, these abuses are less fatal to the common people than to those who have a share in the administration: it is they that feel the utmost rigour of despotic power. The private sentence of a divan is sufficient to sacrifice the heads of the principal men upon the least suspicion. There is no great body established in this country to render the laws respectable, and the person of the sovereign sacred: no barrier of the constitution against the unjust encroachments of the visir. Hence there is very little remedy for the subject when he is oppressed, or for the master when a conspiracy is formed against his life. The sultan, though considered as the most potent sovereign in the world, is at the same time the least settled on the throne; he is deposed in one day's insurrection. In this, the Turks have imitated the manners of the Greek empire, which they destroyed; only they have a greater respect for the Ottoman family, than the Greeks had for their emperors. They depose, they murder,

murder a sultan, but always in favour of the next heir. On the contrary, the Greek empire had, by divers assassinations, passed through twenty different families.

The fear of being dethroned is a greater check to the Turkish emperors, than all the laws of the Alcoran. Though he is absolute master in his seraglio, master of the lives of his officers by means of the *fetsas*, or decrees of the Musti, yet he has not the same power over the customs of the empire; he cannot increase the taxes, nor meddle with the public money; even his private treasure is separate from that of the public.

The sultan's office is sometimes the most easy in the world, while that of the grand vizir is the most laborious; the latter is at the same time constable, chancellor, and first president. The reward of so much toil is frequently banishment or strangling.

The post of bashaw used to be no less dangerous; and, till the present times, their fate has been generally a violent death. All this proves that they were long an unpolished people, with the same barbarity of manners as that which prevailed for many ages in the Christian provinces of Europe, when so many persons died upon the scaffold; when la Brosse, the favourite of St. Louis, was hanged; when the minister Laguerre expired under the rack, in the reign of Charles the Fair; when Charles de la Cerda, constable of France, was executed without form of trial, under king John; when Anguran de Marigni was hanged at Montfaucon upon a gibbet of his own erecting; when the body of the prime minister Montaignu was carried to the same gibbet; when the grand master of the knights Templars and so many other knights expired in the flames; and when such cruelties were common in monarchical states. The reader would be greatly mistaken were he to imagine that these barbarities were a consequence of absolute power. Not one Christian prince at that time was despotic, nor is the grand seignior so now. It is true that several sultans made all laws bend to their will;

for instance, Mahomet II. Selim, and Solyman. Conquerors meet with very little opposition from their subjects; but our historians are mistaken, when they look upon the Ottoman empire as a government essentially despotic.

Count Marfigli, who was better informed of these matters, expresses himself thus: *In tutte le nostre storie sentiamo esaltar la sovranità che così dispoticamente praticasi dal sultano: ma quanto si scostano elle dal vero!*—*We find that all our historians extol the supreme power, which is thus despotically exercised by the sultan: but how wide are they from the truth!* He says, that the militia of the janizaries, which remain at Constantinople, and are called Capiculi, are empowered by the laws to imprison the sultan, to put him to death, and to appoint his successor. He adds, that the grand seignior is frequently obliged to consult the civil and military officers in concluding peace or war.

Neither are the bashaws absolute in their provinces, as we commonly imagine; for they depend upon the divan. The principal inhabitants have a right to complain of their conduct; and to send memorials against them to the grand divan of Constantinople. In a word, Marfigli concludes with qualifying the Turkish government as a democracy. And indeed it is nearly such a form of government as that of Tunis and Algiers. Those sultans, whom the people dare not look in the face, who are accosted with such prostrations as bear the resemblance of divine worship, have only the externals of despotism; they are not absolute, except when they know how to exert that lust for arbitrary power, which seems to be innate in all mankind. Louis XI. Henry VIII. Sixtus Quintus, and other princes, were as despotic as any sultan whatever. Were we thus to fathom the secrets of Asiatic thrones, which are seldom revealed to strangers, we should find that there is not so much despotism in the world as people imagine. In Europe we have seen princes, who are vassals to a limited monarch, act with more arbitrary authority in their own territories than the emperors of Persia

Persia and India. And yet it would be very erroneous to imagine, that the territories of those princes are by their constitution subject to a despotic government.

All the histories of modern nations, except perhaps those of England and Germany, lead us into error, because they seldom distinguish between times and persons, between laws and abuses, between occasional events and established customs.

We should be likewise mistaken, were we to fancy that the Turkish government is an uniform administration, and that couriers set out every day from the seraglio with orders to the governors of the several provinces. This vast empire, which was formed by conquest at different times, and which continued, as we shall see, to increase in power till the eighteenth century, is composed of thirty different nations, that have neither the same language, religion, nor manners. They are Greeks of the ancient Ionia, on the coast of Asia Minor and Achaia; they are the inhabitants of the Taurica Chersonesus; they are the Getes converted to Christianity, and known by the name of Walachians and Moldavians; they are Arabians, Armenians, Bulgarians, Illyrians, Jews; in short, they are Egyptians, and successors of the ancient Carthaginians, whom we shall soon see swallowed up by the Ottoman power. The Turkish militia alone has conquered all these nations, and still holds them in subjection. They are all differently governed; some submit to princes appointed by the Port, as Walachia, Moldavia, and Crim Tartary. The Greeks live under a municipal administration dependent on a bashaw. The number of the conquered is immense, in comparison to that of the conquerors; there are but very few native Turks; not one of them cultivates the earth, or applies himself to the liberal arts. We may say of them what Virgil says of the Romans, *their art is to command*. The great difference between the Turkish conquerors and the ancient Romans, is, that the latter incorporated themselves with all the vanquished nations,

whereas the former continue separate from those whom they have subdued, and by whom they are surrounded.

There are, it is true, about two hundred thousand Greeks still remaining in Constantinople; but these are so many artificers or merchants who toil for their lords and masters. They are a whole conquered nation still permitted to live in their capital, but not so much as suffered to wear the Turkish dress.

We may add to this remark, that all these countries from the Archipelago to the Euphrates, were subdued by one single power; and yet twenty combined powers, with all their crusades, were able to make only very short settlements in those same provinces, although they had twenty times the number of soldiers, and they had made repeated attempts for the space of two hundred years.

Sir Paul Ricaut, an author who lived long in Turkey, attributes the stability of the Ottoman empire to a *supernatural power*. He cannot conceive how such a government, which depends on the caprice of the janizaries, should be able to support itself against its own soldiers and its enemies. But the Roman empire lasted five hundred years at Rome, and near fourteen centuries in the East, in the midst of mutiny and sedition; the sovereigns were dethroned, but the throne subsisted. The Turks have the same veneration for the Ottoman line: this is in some measure their fundamental law: the sultan is often deposed, but as we have already observed, the empire is never given away to a strange family. The internal constitution of the empire has therefore nothing to fear, although the sovereign and his vizirs are often in danger.

Hitherto this empire has rarely been exposed to foreign invasions. The Persians have seldom broke in upon the Turkish frontiers. On the contrary, we shall see sultan Amurath IV. taking Bagdat by storm from the Persians, in 1638, and still continuing master of Mesopotamia, while he sends a body of troops, on the one hand, to the great Mogul against Persia, and; on

the other, threatens the Venetians. The Germans have never appeared at the gates of Constantinople, as the Turks have done before Vienna. It is only since the reign of Peter the Great that the Russians are become formidable to the Turks. In a word, ferocity and rapine first laid the foundation of the Ottoman empire, and the divisions of Christian princes have been the means of supporting it. In all this there is nothing supernatural. We shall see in what manner this empire increased in power, and long retained its barbarous customs, which are at length beginning to be more civilized.

C H A P. XCIV.

Of Louis XI. King of France.

AFTER Charles VII. had begun to establish his power by the expulsion of the English, by the acquisition of so many provinces re-united to the crown, and in short, by perpetuating the subsidies, the feudal government soon expired in France.

For a contrary reason the feudal order was established in Germany under elective emperors, who, as emperors, had neither territories nor subsidies. Italy was still divided into republics and independent principalities. Spain and the North were both strangers to absolute power; while England, in the midst of its divisions, was sowing the seeds of that extraordinary government, whose root, though often cut, and often moistened with blood, has at length, after a series of ages, produced, to the surprise of nations, an equal mixture of liberty and regal authority.

Burgundy and Britany were the only two great fiefs remaining in France; but their power rendered them independent; and notwithstanding the feudal laws, they were not considered in Europe as a part of the kingdom. The duke of Burgundy, Philip the Good, had

had even stipulated that he should not yield homage to Charles VII. when he forgave him the murder of duke John his father.

The princes of the blood in France had peerages for their appanage, but dependent on the jurisdiction of the parliament. The lords, so powerful on their lands, had no longer that power which they formerly enjoyed in the state: there was scarce any beyond the Loire but the count of Foix that intituled himself *prince by the grace of God*, and coined money; but the lords of the fiefs, and the corporations of the great cities had immense privileges.

Louis XI. son of Charles VII. was the first absolute king in Europe, since the decline of the house of Charlemagne. He did not attain the easy enjoyment of this power till after violent commotions. His life is a most remarkable contrast. Ought he, to the disgrace and confusion of virtue to be considered as a great king, he who is described to us as an unnatural son, a cruel brother, a bad father, and a perfidious neighbour? He embittered the latter end of his father's days, and was the cause of his death: for the unfortunate Charles VII. died, as every one knows, through fear lest his son should destroy him; chusing to starve himself in order to avoid the poison which he so much dreaded. This fear alone in a father, of being poisoned by his own son, proves but too well that the latter was looked upon as capable of committing the flagitious deed.

After maturely examining the whole conduct of Louis XI. may we not look upon him as a man who wanted to colour his acts of violence by base artifice, and to maintain his impostures by cruelty? How comes it that in the beginning of his reign, so many lords who had been strongly attached to his father, and especially the famous count de Dunois, whose sword had been the support of the crown, entered into a confederacy against him *for the public good*? They had taken no advantage of the weakness of the government, a thing so often done; but Louis XI. made a bad use of its strength. Is it not plain, that the father, instructed by
his

his own mistakes and misfortunes, had governed extremely well; and that the son, too much elated by power, began with governing ill?

This confederacy endangered at once both his crown and his life. The battle fought at Montlheri did not¹⁴⁶⁵ prove decisive; but it is certain that the king lost it, since the confederates remained masters of the field of battle, and he was obliged to grant them every thing they demanded. Louis however did not consider this disgraceful treaty as binding; nor did he ever regard his oath, unless he had sworn it on a bit of wood, which was called *the true cross of St. Louis*. He believed, with the common people of those days, that perjury on this bit of wood never failed to be followed by death within the year.

The barbarian had no sooner concluded this treaty, than he caused several of the citizens of Paris, who were suspected of favouring his enemies, to be tied into sacks and thrown into the Seine. We find this horrid fact recorded in the chronicle of St. Denis. After all, however, he could not disunite the confederates, till he granted to each of them what they required. Thus we observe a mixture of weakness, even where he displayed his abilities.

He made Charles, duke of Burgundy, his implacable enemy. This prince, who was the son of Philip the Good, was master of Burgundy, Franche-Comté, Flanders, Artois, of the towns on the Somme, and of Holland. Louis stirred up the people of Liege to¹⁴⁶⁸ commit a perfidious act against this duke of Burgundy, and to take up arms against him. At the same time he put himself in the power of this prince at Perronne, thinking thereby to deceive him. What an indiscreet step! but he was detected, and after having been kept prisoner in the castle of Perronne, he was obliged to attend his vassal against those very people of Liege, whom he had spirited up to rebellion. Could there be a greater humiliation!

He was not only of a perfidious disposition himself, but obliged the duke of Burgundy to be so likewise; for

for this prince, though naturally of a rash and violent temper, was far from being addicted to fraud. Louis XI. in deceiving his neighbours, invited them, as it were, to deceive him in return. To this retaliation of fraud were added the most horrid cruelties. In those days it was considered as the right of war to hang, drown, or put to the sword all who were made prisoners in battle, and to destroy all the old men, women and children in the places that were taken. Maximilian, who was afterwards emperor, caused a Gascon captain to be hanged, who had bravely defended a castle against his whole army; and Louis XI. by way of reprisal, sentenced fifty gentlemen of Maximilian's army, who had fallen into his hands, to be put to death in the same manner. It was to revenge the cruelties of Louis, that Charles duke of Burgundy, at the taking of Dinant, ordered all the inhabitants to be put to the sword, and the town itself to be reduced to ashes.

Louis XI. being afraid of his brother, the duke of Berry, this prince was poisoned by his confessor, a Benedictine monk, named Favre Vesois. This is not one of those dubious impositions, which the malicious vulgar are apt to swallow without proof. The duke of Berry was at supper, and sat between his mistress, Madame de Montsrau, and his confessor. The latter caused a very large peach to be set before them; the lady expired immediately upon eating of it; the prince fell into terrible convulsions, and died soon after.

Odet Daidie, a brave nobleman, desirous of revenging the duke's death, to whom he had been always attached, carried the guilty monk out of Louis's jurisdiction into Britany. Here he was fairly tried; but the day they were to pass sentence, he was found dead in his bed. To quiet the public clamour, Louis ordered the writings to be brought to him, and appointed commissioners; but they decided nothing, and the king amply rewarded them. There were very few in Europe who doubted that Louis had committed this crime, he, who when dauphin, had made his father afraid of his life. Historians ought not accuse him without sufficient

cient proof, but they ought to be sorry for his having deserved this suspicion: they should observe, that every prince who has been guilty of a notorious crime, is guilty also of the rash judgments which the people make on all his actions.

Such was the conduct of Louis XI. towards his vassals and his relations; let us now see how he behaved towards his neighbours. Edward IV. king of England, landed in France, in order to recover the conquests of his ancestors. Louis was able to fight, but chose rather¹⁴⁷⁵ to pay tribute. He bribed the chief officers among the English, made presents of wine to the whole army, and purchased the return of this army into England. Would it not have been more becoming the dignity of a king of France, to have employed his money in making preparations to oppose and subdue, rather than in seducing a prince who was weakly supported, and whom he had no reason to dread?

Princes of generous minds are not afraid of choosing men of rank and abilities for their favourites and ministers. Louis XI. had none hardly for his confidents and ministers, but persons of mean birth, whose minds were still more groveling than their condition.

Few tyrants ever put more citizens to death by the hands of the common executioner, and by more exquisite torments, than Louis XI. The annals of the time mention four thousand subjects executed either in public or in private during his reign. Dungeons, iron cages, chains, with which his victims were loaded, are the monuments left us by this monarch, which we behold with horror.

It is surprising that father Daniel scarce so much as mentions the execution of James d'Armagnac, duke of¹⁴⁷⁷ Nemours, a known descendant of Clovis. The circumstances and apparatus of his death, the confiscation of his estate, the dungeons in which his young children were shut up till the death of Louis XI. are melancholy as well as interesting subjects of curiosity. It is not known for certain what crime this prince committed. He was tried by commissioners, from whence we may

presume he was not guilty. Some historians charge him in general, with having formed a design to seize the king, and having employed a person to kill the dauphin. Such a charge deserves no credit. A petty prince who had taken shelter at the foot of the Pyrenees, could hardly at that distance, and in time of full peace, seize on Louis XI. who was absolute and all powerful in his dominions. The notion of killing the dauphin, who was yet an infant, and of preserving the father, is one of those extravagant whims that never could come into the head of a statesman. This however is beyond doubt, that Louis XI. hated the house of Armagnac, that he gave orders for arresting the duke of Nemours at Carlat in 1477, that he confined him in an iron cage in the bastille, that having drawn up the indictment himself, he commissioned judges to try him, among whom was Philip de Comines, a famous traitor, who having long betrayed the secrets of the house of Burgundy to the king, went over to the service of France, and whose memoirs are esteemed, though written with the reserve of a courtier, who was afraid to tell the truth even after the death of Louis XI.

The king ordered the duke of Nemours to be examined, racked, and condemned in his iron cage. He afterwards confessed to a priest in a hall hung with black. The confessing to a priest was a favour which began to be granted to criminals. The black hanging was the ceremony observed with princes. Thus was Conradin executed at Naples, and thus was Mary Stuart afterwards treated in England. The people of the west were ceremoniously barbarous, and this refinement in inhumanity was known only to them. The only favour this unfortunate prince was able to obtain, was that of being interred in the habit of a Franciscan, a favour worthy of the superstition of those atrocious times, which was equal to their barbarity.

But cruel, beyond all example, was it in Louis XI. to place the duke's young children under the scaffold in the market-hall at Paris, to receive their father's blood upon

upon their heads. Accordingly they went from thence all covered with it; in which condition they were carried to the baffle, and put into dungeons made in the form of scuttles, where their bodies were in continual pain. Their teeth likewise were drawn at different times. This species of torture, no less trifling than odious, was at that time in use; John, king of France, Edward III. king of England, and the emperor Charles IV. had applied it to the Jews in France, in England, and in the several towns of Germany, as the means of extorting from them their money. A detail of the horrid tortures the young princes underwent would be incredible, were it not attested by the petition, which those unfortunate princes presented to the states after the death of Louis XI. in 1483.

Never was there less honour than during this reign. The judges were not ashamed to share the spoils even of persons on whom they had pronounced sentence. The traitor Philip de Comines, who had meanly betrayed the duke of Burgundy, and who was one of the commissioners, had the duke's estates in the district of Tournay.

The preceding times, notwithstanding the fierce and barbarous manners of the people, had been sometimes productive of illustrious characters. In the reign of Charles VII. there was a Dunois, a La Trimouille, a Clifton, a Richemont, a Saintraille, a La Hire, all magistrates of great merit: but under Louis XI. there was not one great man. He degraded the nation: there was no virtue left: submission supplied the stead of every other qualification, and the people at length grew as tame as galley slaves.

And yet this artful and obdurate wretch had two propensities, which ought naturally to have humanized his manners, namely, love and devotion. He had mistresses, by whom he had had three bastards; and besides, he used to go on pilgrimages. Love indeed was part of his natural character; but his devotion was only the superstitious fear of a weak inordinate mind. He was always covered with relics, and wore a leaden

image of our lady on his cap, of whom it is pretended that he used to ask forgiveness for his assassinations even before he committed them. He gave the county of Boulogne, by contract, to the blessed virgin. Piety, however, consists not in making the blessed virgin a countess, but in abstaining from such actions as our conscience condemns, and God must punish.

He introduced the Italian custom of ringing a bell at noon, and of saying an *Ave Maria*. He asked the pope for the privilege of wearing the surplice and the *amict*, or garment worn by the priests when they say mass, and of being anointed a second time with the oil of the holy vial of Rheims.

At length, perceiving the approach of death, he shut himself up in the castle of Plessis-les-tours, where, inaccessible to his subjects, surrounded with guards, and devoured with inquietude, he sent to Calabria for an hermit, whose name was Francis Martorillo, since revered by the name of St. Francis of Paula. He threw himself at his feet, and with tears in his eyes, intreated him to intercede with God, that he might prolong his life; as if the eternal order of things ought to have changed at the voice of a Calabrian in a French village, only that a weak and perverse mind might remain in a decayed frame, longer than nature would permit. While he was thus applying to a foreign hermit for life, he thought to re-animate his constitution by drinking plentifully of childrens blood, which he vainly hoped would correct the acrimony of his own. It was one of the abuses of the ignorant practice of physic in those times, which had been introduced by the Jews, to prescribe the drinking the blood of young children, to old persons troubled with apoplexy, and to leprous and epileptic patients.

It is impossible to meet with a more wretched fate than this prince did, in the midst of prosperity, continually tortured by an uneasy mind, by remorse, by fear, and by the vexation of being hated.

And yet he was the first king of France that took upon him the title of the most Christian, almost at the same time that Ferdinand of Arragon, a prince as famous

mous for his perfidy as for his conquests, assumed the name of Catholic. Such a multitude of vices however, did not deprive Louis XI. of his good qualities. He did not want courage, but could attack an enemy like a king; he understood mankind, and was versed in business; he would likewise have justice administered, suffering none but himself to be unjust with impunity.

After Paris had been laid waste by a contagion, it was repeopled through his care and vigilance; it is true, that among the new inhabitants there was a great number of thieves and vagabonds, but the severity of the magistrates soon made them good citizens. In his reign there were fourscore thousand inhabitants in that city able to bear arms. To him the people are indebted for the first humiliation of the nobility; an event for which about fifty families complained, and more than five hundred thousand had reason to rejoice. He likewise prevented the parliament and university of Paris, (two bodies equally ignorant, as all the French were at that time) from persecuting, as sorcerers, the first printers who came from Germany into France.

It was he that established the post-office, but not in the manner in which it is regulated at present in all parts of Europe. He only renewed the *veredarii*, or *couriers* of Charlemagne, and of the ancient Roman empire. Two hundred and thirty messengers were always employed in carrying his orders. Private people might ride the horses appointed for these messengers, paying ten-pence a horse for every station of four leagues. The letters were delivered from town to town by the king's messengers; a regulation which for a long time obtained only in France. He wanted to render the weights and measures uniform throughout his dominions, as they had been in the time of Charlemagne. In short, he was an instance that a bad man may promote the public good, when it is not repugnant to his own private interest.

The imposts under Charles VII. independently of the crown lands, amounted to seventeen hundred thousand

livres; under Louis XI. they increased to four millions seven hundred thousand livres; and the livre being at that time ten to the mark, this sum amounted to three and twenty millions five hundred thousand livres present money. If, pursuing these proportions, we examine into the price of provisions, and especially of corn, the principal branch of human support, we shall find that it was not half so much as in our days. Thus, three and twenty millions went as far with them as forty-six with us.

Such was the power of France, before Burgundy, Franche-Comté, Artois, the territory of Boulogne, the towns on the Somme, Provence and Anjou, were by Louis XI. incorporated with the French monarchy. France soon rose to be the most powerful kingdom in Europe; it was like a river increased by twenty lesser streams, and cleared of the dirt and mud which had long disturbed its waters.

Titles at that time began to be given to power: Louis XI. was the first king of France who took that of *Majesty*, which the emperor only had hitherto borne; but the German chancery would never give it to any king, till very lately. The kings of Arragon, Castile and Portugal, had the title of *Highness*; and the king of England was stiled *your Grace*. Louis XI. might very properly have been stiled *your Despotism*.

We have seen by what a series of successful crimes he became the first absolute king in Europe, since the grand establishment of feudal government. Ferdinand the Catholic was never able to attain the same power in Arragon. Isabella, by her artifices, had prepared the Castilians for passive obedience, but she did not rule despotically. Each state, each province, each city in Europe, had its particular privileges. The feudal lords often opposed these privileges, while the kings endeavoured to reduce both lords and towns alike under their obedience. None of them obtained their ends except Louis XI. but it was by shedding the blood of the Armagnacs and the Luxemburgs on the scaffold, by sacrificing every thing to his suspicions, and by giving

giving immense rewards to those who executed his bloody purposes. Isabella of Castile went to work with more cunning, and without bloodshed. For instance, when she wanted to reunite the dutchy of Placentia to the crown, we find her, by insinuations and money, stirring up the duke of Placentia's vassals against him; and these vassals assembling in a body insist on becoming vassals to the queen, who consents out of complaisance.

At the same time that Louis XI. increased his power over the people by his severity, he enlarged his kingdom by his industry. He obtained Provence of the last sovereign count of that country, whereby he wrested a great fief from the empire, just as Philip of Valois had acquired Dauphiny. Anjou and Maine, which belonged to the count of Provence, were likewise reunited to the crown. Policy, money, and good fortune, gradually extended the limits of the kingdom of France, which since Hugh Capet's time had made no great figure, and which the English had brought to the brink of destruction. The same good fortune reunited Burgundy to France; and, by the blunders of the last duke, the body of the state recovered a province which had been imprudently separated from it.

At the period we are speaking of, we may observe the transition from anarchy to tyranny in the government of France. These changes however, as we have seen, were not effected without violent convulsions. In former reigns, the feudal lords had been oppressors, whereas under Louis XI. we find them oppressed. The manners of the people were pretty nearly the same throughout France, England, Germany, and all the northern parts of Europe. Barbarism, superstition, and ignorance covered the face of the whole earth, Italy only excepted. The papal power still continued to lord it over all the other powers of Europe, and the abject state of all the nations on this side the Alps, was, in fact, the true support of this authority, against which so many princes had exerted their fruitless efforts

in

in different ages. Louis XI. submitted to this yoke, in order to be more compleatly master at home. It was doubtless to the interest of Rome that the people should every where remain in a state of ignorance, and in this the popes succeeded to their wish. They were weak enough at Cologne to believe themselves possessed of the rotten bones of those pretended kings, who are said to have come from the farthermost parts of the East to bring gold and other presents to the infant Jesus in a stable. Some of the relicts of these three monarchs (of whom by the bye no mention is made in the Evangelists) were sent to Louis XI. and that prince was made to believe that nothing but these rotten bones could possibly cure his complaints. There is still extant a letter written by him to the prior of our Lady of Salles, in which he requests him to procure for him, through the intercession of the Virgin, a quartan fever; having been assured by his physicians that a quartan fever would certainly be the means of restoring him to health. The ignorant quackery of the physicians of those days seems therefore to have been proportioned to the folly of this prince, whose weakness was equal to his tyranny. This is the portrait, not only of Louis XI. but of all the rest of Europe at that time. The history of those days serves only to excite our disgust; and were it not essential to the interest of princes and others to be informed of the revolutions of so many barbarous governments, their time could not be more unprofitably employed than in reading this part of history.

C H A P. XCV.

Of Burgundy and the Swifs at the Time of Louis XI. in the Fifteenth Century.

CHARLES the Bold, who was descended in a direct line from John king of France, possessed the dukedom of Burgundy, as the appanage of his family,

family, with the towns on the Somme which had been yielded to him by Charles VII. By right of succession he had Franche-Comté, Artois, Flanders, and almost all Holland. His towns in the Low Countries enjoyed a most flourishing trade, which began to rival that of Venice. Antwerp was the staple of the northern nations; in Ghent there were fifty thousand artificers employed in the woollen manufactory. Bruges was as trading a town as Antwerp. Arras was celebrated for its beautiful tapestries, which still go by its name in Germany, England, and Italy.

The princes at that time were accustomed to sell their territories, when they wanted money, just as a private person may now sell his house or estate. This custom had subsisted ever since the time of the crusades. Ferdinand king of Arragon sold Roussillon to Louis XI. with the equity of redemption. Charles duke of Burgundy had lately purchased Guelderland. The duke of Austria had likewise sold him whatever territories he possessed in Alsace and in the neighbourhood of Switzerland. This acquisition was worth a great deal more than Charles gave for it. He was now master of a compact territory, from the banks of the Somme to the gates of Strasburg. His business would have been to enjoy it: few kings in Europe were so potent as he; none was richer or more magnificent. His intent was to erect his dominions into a kingdom, which some time or other might have been extremely prejudicial to France. All that was requisite for this purpose, was to purchase a diploma of the emperor Frederick III. For the custom still continued of applying to the emperor for the title of king; an homage paid to the ancient grandeur of the Roman name. The negotiation miscarried; but Charles intending to add Lorraine and Switzerland to his dominions, was very sure, if he succeeded, of making himself king without any other prince's permission.

Charles did not attempt to conceal his ambition, and this was chiefly the reason why they gave him the surname of *Bold*. We may judge of his pride by

1474 the reception he gave to the Swiss deputies. Some of the historians of that country affirm, that the duke obliged those deputies to address him upon their knees: a strange contrast in the manners of a free people, who not long after were his conquerors!

The duke of Burgundy's pretension, to which the Helvetians submitted, was founded on this. A great many Swiss towns were inclosed within the territories, which he purchased of the duke of Austria: and Charles imagined he had made a purchase of slaves. Besides, it had been the custom for the deputies of the commons to address the king of France on their knees; and the duke of Burgundy had preserved the ceremonial of the head of his family. We have observed, that several kings, after the emperor's example, had insisted on the ceremony of the knee from those who accosted them, or waited at their table; and that this Asiatic custom had been introduced by Constantine, and before him by Dioclesian. Thence also arose the custom of a vassal's doing homage to his lord on both his knees. Thence also the ceremony of kissing the pope's toe. Such is the history of human vanity.

Philip de Comines, and a great number of succeeding writers, pretend that the war against the Swiss, which proved so fatal to the duke of Burgundy, was owing to a cart loaded with sheep skins. The most trifling incident will produce a war, when princes have a mind to quarrel: but long before that, Louis XI. had been stirring up the Swiss against the duke of Burgundy, and many acts of hostility had been committed on both sides before the accident of the cart. It is therefore very certain that the ambition of Charles the Bold was the only cause of the war.

At that time there were only eight Swiss cantons; Fribourg, Soleure, Schaffhouse, and Appenzel, had not yet joined in the confederacy. Basil, an imperial city, whose situation on the Rhine rendered it both powerful and wealthy, did not constitute a part of this infant republic, which had nothing to distinguish it but

but the poverty, simplicity, and valour of its inhabitants. The deputies of Berne represented to this ambitious prince, that their whole country was not worth the spurs of his knights; they did not address him on their knees, but spoke with modesty, and defended themselves with bravery.

The duke's gend'arms, all covered with gold, were twice intirely routed by these simple peasants, who were astonished at the riches they found in the enemy's camp. 1476

Who could have supposed at that time, when the largest diamond in Europe, taken by a Swiss soldier at the battle of Grandson, was sold to his general for a crown; who, I say, could have supposed that there would be one day, in Switzerland, cities as fine and as wealthy as the capital of the dukedom of Burgundy? These people were for a long time strangers to the luxury of diamonds and embroidered silks; and as soon as it was known it was prohibited: but solid riches, which consist in the cultivation of the earth, have been gathered there by free and victorious hands. In our days they have begun to study the conveniencies of life. All the sweets of society, together with the improvements of sound philosophy, without which society has no charms, have made their way into some particular spots of Switzerland, where they enjoy a milder climate, together with the blessings of plenty. In short, the inhabitants of this country, formerly so rude and uncultivated, may in some places be said to have joined the urbanity of Athens to the simplicity of Sparta.

Charles the Bold wanted to wreak his vengeance on Lorraine, and to wrest the city of Nancy, which he had taken once before from duke René its lawful sovereign. But those very Swifs, who had defeated him before, assisted by their countrymen of Fribourg and Soleure, who by this very act shewed themselves worthy of their alliance, routed once more the troops of this usurper, when he purchased with his blood the name of Bold, which has been given him by posterity.

Then it was that Louis XI. took possession of Artois, of the towns on the Somme, of the dukedom of Burgundy as a fief male, and of the city of Besançon by the right of conveniency.

Princess Mary, daughter of Charles the Bold, and heiress to so many provinces, was thus stripped at once of two-thirds of her territories. The seventeen provinces which this princess still preserved, might have been likewise joined to the kingdom of France, had she married the son of Louis XI. who vainly flattered himself that he might make her his daughter-in-law, while he was stripping her of her patrimony. Thus this great politician missed the opportunity of uniting Franche-Comté and all the Low Countries to the French monarchy.

The inhabitants of Ghent and the rest of the Flemings, who enjoyed more liberty at that time under their sovereigns, than even the English do at present under their kings, obliged their princess to marry Maximilian, son of the emperor Frederick III.

In our days the people hear of the marriages of their princes, of peace and war, of new taxes, and indeed of their most essential concerns, by the declaration of their sovereigns; but it was not so in Flanders. The inhabitants of Ghent insisted that their princess should marry a German; and so strenuously did they insist upon it, that they brought Mary of Burgundy's chancellor, and Imbercourt her chamberlain, to the block, for endeavouring to give her away to the dauphin of France. These two ministers were executed in the presence of the young princess, who in vain entreated her ferocious subjects to pardon them.

Maximilian being thus invited rather by the inhabitants of Ghent, than by the princess, concluded the marriage like a private gentleman, who makes his fortune by marrying an heiress: his wife defrayed the expences of his journey, and maintained both him and his retinue. He had the princess, but not her dominions; in short, he was only the consort of a sovereign: and after the death of his wife, when he was intrusted
with

with the guardianship of his son, when he had the administration of the Low Countries, and even when he was elected Cæsar and king of the Romans, the people of Bruges detained him in prison four months, in 1488, for infringing their privileges. If princes have often abused their power, the people have as often abused their rights.

This marriage between the heiress of Burgundy and Maximilian, proved the source of all those wars, which for such a series of years set the houses of France and Austria at variance. It was this that gave rise to the grandeur of Charles V. and that had like to have enslaved all Europe; only because the citizens of Ghent insisted on having the disposal of their princess in marriage.

C H A P. XCVI.

Of the feudal Government after Louis XI. in the Eleventh Century.

IN Italy, France, and Germany we have seen in what manner anarchy was turned into despotism under Charlemagne; and how despotism was destroyed by anarchy under his descendants.

You are sensible it is a mistake to think that the fiefs were not hereditary before the time of Hugh Capet. Normandy is a convincing proof of the contrary. Bavaria and Aquitaine were hereditary before Charlemagne; and almost all the fiefs were such in Italy under the Lombard kings. In the reigns of Charles the Fat and Charles the Simple, the great officers, as well as several bishops, assumed the rights and prerogatives of sovereignty. But there had been always proprietors of large estates in land, who were called *Sires* in France, *Herren* in Germany, and *Ricos Hombres* in Spain. There had been also some large cities governed by their own magistrates, as Rome, Milan,

Milan, Lyons, Rheims, &c. The limits of the privileges and liberties of those cities, as well as those of the power or prerogative of the lords have been perpetually shifting. Force and fortune have generally decided these matters. If these great officers turned usurpers, Charlemagne's father did the same. Pepin, grandson of Arnold, the preceptor of Dagobert and bishop of Metz, stripped the race of Clovis. Hugh Capet dethroned the posterity of Pepin; and Hugh's descendants could never unite the scattered members of the ancient monarchy.

The feudal power in France received a mortal wound from Louis XI. Ferdinand and Isabella were fighting against it in Castile and Arragon. In England it made way for a mixed government. In Poland it subsisted under another form. But it was in Germany that it preserved and even increased its vigour. The count de Boulainvilliers calls this constitution, *an effort of the human understanding*. Loiseau and other lawyers stile it, *a whimsical institution, a monster composed of members without a head*.

It does not seem to be such a mighty effort of genius, but a natural and very common effect of reason and human cupidity, that the proprietors of lands should chuse to be masters of their own estates. From the further extremity of Muscovy, as far as the mountains of Castile, all the great lords have had the same idea, without communicating it to each other: they have been all desirous that neither their lives nor estates should depend on the arbitrary will of a king: against this power they have all associated in every country; and yet they have all exercised it, as far as they could, over their own subjects. Thus was Europe governed for above five hundred years. This form of administration was unknown to the ancient Greeks and Romans: but it is by no means whimsical, since it is so generally established in Europe. It seems unjust, inasmuch as the major part of mankind are oppressed by the smaller number; and a private citizen can never rise but by a general confusion. Under a feudal government

government there are no great cities, no commerce, no polite arts. The powerful cities in Germany and Flanders, flourished only in consequence of a small shadow of liberty. The city of Ghent, for example, as well as Bruges and Antwerp, were more in the nature of republics under the protection of the dukes of Burgundy, than subject to the arbitrary power of those prince. The same may be said of the imperial cities.

You have seen how the feudal anarchy was established throughout a great part of Europe under the successors of Charlemagne. But before his time there had been a more regular administration of fiefs under the Lombard kings in Italy. The Franks, who invaded Gaul, shared the spoils with Clovis; hence the count de Boulainvilliers insists that the lords of castles, or manors, are all sovereigns in France. But where is the estate whose owner can say, I am descended from a conqueror of Gaul? And even were he descended in a right line from one of those usurpers, would not the cities and the common people have a better right to resume their liberties, than this Frank, or this Visigoth, had to enslave them?

It cannot be said that the feudal jurisdiction was established in Germany by right of conquest, as in Lombardy and France. No foreign nation ever made the conquest of all Germany; and yet of all countries in the world this is the only one, in which the feudal jurisdictions subsist. In Russia, the *Boyards*, or great lords, have their subjects; but they are subjects also themselves, and do not compose a body like the princes of Germany. The kans of Crim Tartary, the princes of Walachia and Moldavia, are indeed feudal lords, who depend on the Turkish sultan. But they may be deposed by an order of the divan; whereas the German princes cannot without a decree of the whole nation. There is a greater equality among the nobles of Poland, than among the proprietors of lands in Germany, and yet theirs is not a feudal government. There are no rear-vassals in Poland: one noble is not subject to another

another as in Germany: he is sometimes his servant, but never his vassal. Poland is an aristocratical republic, in which the common people are slaves.

The feudal laws subsist in Italy in a different manner. In Lombardy, all the estates are reckoned fiefs of the empire, and this occasions a prodigious deal of confusion: for if ever the emperors were paramounts of those fiefs, it was only as kings of Italy, and successors to those of Lombardy. Now the diet of Ratisbon surely is not sovereign of Italy. But what has been the consequence? The Germanic liberty having prevailed over the imperial authority in Germany, and the empire being grown a distinct thing from the emperor, the lords of Italian fiefs are therefore called the empire's, but not the emperor's vassals. Thus one feudal administration is become subject to another. The kingdom of Naples is also a different kind of fief. It is an homage which the strong pays to the weak; a ceremony kept up by custom.

The feudal jurisdictions prevailed in all parts of Europe, and yet the laws of fiefs were different in each country. For instance, the male branch of the house of Burgundy happening to be extinct, Louis XI. thought himself entitled to inherit that estate. If the branch of Saxony or Bavaria had failed, the emperor would have had no right to seize on these provinces. Much less could the pope pretend to seize on the kingdom of Naples, should the reigning house be extinct. These rights are established by force, custom and compact. And indeed Louis XI. acquired his by force; for there was still living a prince of the house of Burgundy, namely, the count of Nevers, a descendant of the first of his branch, who was instituted duke of Burgundy by king John; and yet this prince dared not so much as to claim his right. It was likewise a very dubious case, whether Mary of Burgundy ought not to have succeeded her father. In the donation of Burgundy by king John, it is mentioned that the *heirs should succeed*; and surely a daughter is heir.

The

The question about male and female fiefs, the right of liege or simple homage, the uncertainty of lords who were vassals of two paramounts at the same time for different lands, or who were vassals to paramounts that disputed about the supreme jurisdiction; these and a thousand other difficulties gave rise to those suits which the sword alone could decide. The fortunes of private people were still in a worse situation.

What a situation for instance must it be, for a husbandman to be subject to a lord, who is himself subject to another lord, and this still dependant on a third! If he has a suit, he must go through all these courts, and spend all he has before he can obtain a definitive sentence. Surely it was not the people that ever of their own choice adopted this form of government. There are no countries worthy of being inhabited, but those in which all orders of men are equally subjected to the laws.

C H A P. XCVII.

Of CHIVALRY.

THE extinction of the house of Burgundy, the government of Louis XI. and above all the new manner of waging war which had been introduced over all Europe, contributed insensibly to abolish what we call chivalry, a kind of dignity and confraternity, of which there soon remained no more than a weak and imperfect idea.

This chivalry was a warlike institution, introduced among the nobility, as the devout confraternities had been established among the burghers. The anarchy and confusion under which Europe had laboured upon the decline of the house of Charlemagne, gave rise to this institution. Dukes, counts, viscounts, and lords of manors were grown sovereigns on their own estates: they waged war against each other; but instead of

those great armies of Charles Martel, Pepin and Charlemagne, almost all Europe was divided into small bodies of seven or eight hundred men, and sometimes less. Two or three towns formed a petty state, which was continually at war with its neighbour. There was no longer any communication between the provinces, no longer any high roads, no longer any security for the merchants, though the public could not do without them: every owner of a castle extorted from them on the road; and the multitude of towers on the banks of rivers and in narrow passages of mountains, were only so many nests or lurking holes of robbers. They carried off the women, and plundered the merchants.

A great many lords insensibly entered into an association, and even vowed, to maintain the public security and to protect the ladies. This virtuous institution received a greater force by being made a religious act. Associations of this sort were formed in almost all the provinces: every lord of a great fief held it an honour to be a knight, and to be admitted into the order.

Towards the eleventh century, both religious and civil ceremonies were established, which seemed to give a new character to the candidate: he was obliged to fast, to confess, and receive the sacrament, and to pass a whole night armed cap-à-pee. He was made to dine by himself at a separate table, while his godfathers and the ladies who were to put on his armour and to dub him knight, eat at another. For his part, he was clad in a white tunic, and sat at his side-table, where he was forbid to speak, to laugh, or even to eat. The next day he entered the church with his sword hanging about his neck, and the priest gave him his benediction; afterwards he knelt down before the lord or lady who was to put on his armour. The persons of the first rank that assisted at the ceremony, put on his spurs, clad him with a cuirass, with brassets, cuisses*, gauntlets, and with a coat of mail. The godfather

* See Vol. I. page 257.

who installed him, touched him three times on the shoulder with the flat side of his sword, in the name of God, of St. Michael, and of St. George. From that time forward, so often as he heard mass, he drew his sword, and held it erect when the priest read the Gospel.

This installation was followed by high festivals, and oftentimes by tournaments, the expences of which fell upon the people. The great lords of fiefs laid a tax on their subjects for the day, on which their children were to receive the order of knighthood. It was generally at the age of one-and-twenty that they received this title; before that time they were batchelors, which signified the same as *bas chevaliers*, inferior knights, or varlets, and squires; and the lords who had entered the confraternity, sent their children to one another's houses, in order to be educated far from their parents, by the name of varlets, in the apprenticeship of chivalry.

The time of the crusades was the period in which chivalry was most in vogue. The feudal lords, who led their vassals under their flag, were called knights bannerets; not that the bare title of knight gave them a right to appear in the field with a flag. It was power only, and not the ceremony of dubbing, that qualified them to have troops under their command. They were bannerets in virtue of their fiefs, and not of chivalry. This title was only a distinction introduced by custom, and an honour by courtesy; it was never a real dignity in the state, nor had it ever any influence on the form of government. The elections of the emperors and of kings were not made by knights; there was no necessity of having been dubbed to be admitted into the imperial diet, into the parliament of France, or the *cortes* of Spain. The infeoffments, the rights of jurisdiction and dependance, the inheritances, the laws, every thing in fine that was essential, had no sort of relation to chivalry. In this matter therefore, all the writers who have employed themselves on the subject of chivalry have been greatly deceived. They have all of them asserted on the faith of romances, that this honour was a post, an employment, and that laws were established

for the government of the knights. But these pretended laws were nothing more than customs. The great privileges of this institution consisted in the bloody sports called tournaments. Neither a batchelor, nor a squire, generally speaking, were suffered to juggle with a knight.

Even kings themselves would be armed as knights, but this gave them no addition of dignity or power; their intention was merely to encourage chivalry and valour by their example. The knights had a great respect shewn them in society; and this was all the advantage they enjoyed.

In process of time, when king Edward III. had instituted the order of the garter; Philip the Good, duke of Burgundy, the order of the Golden-fleece; and Louis XI. the order of St. Michael, in the beginning as much respected as the other two, and now so ridiculously debased; then the ancient chivalry declined. It had no longer any mark of distinction, nor a head that could confer particular honours or privileges. There were no longer any knights bannerets, when kings and great princes had established regular companies in their armies; then the ancient chivalry became only an empty name. But it was still thought an honour to be dubbed by a great prince, or by a famous warrior: those lords who were constituted in some dignity, added to their title the quality of knight; and all those who made profession of arms, assumed that of esquire.

The military orders of knighthood, as the Templars, the knights of Malta, the Teutonic order, and so many others, are an imitation of the ancient chivalry, which combined the ceremonies of religion with military duty. But this kind of chivalry was absolutely different from the ancient. It produced the monastic military orders, founded by popes, possessed of benefices, and bound by the three monastic vows. Of these extraordinary orders, some have been great conquerors, others have been suppressed for their debauchery, and others subsist still with dignity.

The

The Teutonic order was a sovereign power; the order of Malta is so still, and is likely so to continue.

There is scarce a prince in Europe that has not thought proper to institute an order of knighthood. The simple title of knight, which the kings of England confer on private citizens, without enrolling them in any particular order, is a derivation from the ancient chivalry, but very remote from its source. Its genuine descent has been preserved only in the ceremony, by which the kings of France always confer the honour of knighthood on the ambassadors sent from Venice, and the *accolade*, or embracing about the neck, is the only ceremony preserved in this installation.

The professors of the law erected themselves into an order, like the true knights of arms; this was a proof of the decline of ancient chivalry. The students took the name of Batchelors, after having maintained a thesis; and the doctors of law called themselves knights, a title ridiculous in itself, for originally the *chevalier*, or knight, was a person who fought armed on horseback, which certainly could have no kind of connection with a civilian.

All this affords us a picture that is exceedingly variegated; and if we were attentively to follow the chain of the several customs of Europe since the time of Charlemagne, in respect to government, to the church, to war, to dignities, to finances, to society, and, in fine, even to the article of dress, we should find nothing but a perpetual vicissitude.

C H A P. XCVIII.

Of NOBILITY.

AFTER what we have said in relation to feudal government, it remains to explain, as clearly as possible, what relates to the nobility, who were a long time the sole possessors of fiefs.

The

The term *noble* at first was a title that neither conferred rights, nor was hereditary. *Nobilitas*, among the Romans, signified any thing eminent or worthy notice, and not an order of citizens. The senate was instituted to judge; the knights to fight on horseback, when they were rich enough to keep a horse; and the plebeians were frequently knights, and sometimes senators.

Among the Gauls, the government was in the hands of the principal officers of the towns, and the Druids, to whom the people paid obedience. In every country there has been a distinction of ranks. They who say that all men are equal, speak the strictest truth, if they mean that all men have an equal right to liberty, to the enjoyment of their own property, and to the protection of their own laws. But they would be guilty of a great error, if they thought that all men ought to be on an equality in regard to ranks and employments, when they are not so in regard to their talents or capacities. In this necessary inequality of conditions, neither the ancients, nor indeed nine parts out of ten of the habitable globe, were acquainted with any thing that bore the least resemblance to what we call nobility, as it is now established in some countries of Europe.

The laws and customs of this order have varied like all other things. We have already shewn you that the most ancient hereditary nobility, was that of the patricians of Venice, who had seats in the council as early as the fifth century, before there was a doge; and if there are any descendants of these first magistrates, as it is said, they are undoubtedly the first nobles in Europe. It was the same in the ancient republics of Italy. This nobility was annexed to dignity and employ, and not to lands.

In every other country, nobility became the portion of those who were possessed of lands. In Germany the *Herren*, in Spain the *Ricos Hombres*, and in France and England the *Barons*, enjoyed an hereditary nobility, merely because their feudal or non-feudal lands remained

in

in their families. The titles of duke, count, viscount, and marquis, were at first dignities or offices for life, which afterwards passed from father to son, some sooner, others later.

Upon the decline of the family of Charlemagne, almost all the states of Europe, the republics excepted, were governed as Germany is at present; and we have seen that every possessor of a fief exercised sovereign authority in his own territories, as far as he was able.

It is clear that sovereigns owed no service to any other, except what the petty ones engaged themselves to pay to the great. Thus a castellan, or lord of a castle, paid a pair of spurs to a viscount, who paid a falcon to a count, and this last some other mark of vassalage to a duke. All these acknowledged the king of their country for their lord paramount, though he could not impose a tax upon any one of them. They owed the service of their persons, because they fought for their lands and for themselves, in fighting for the state, and the chief of their state; and hence it comes that at present in France the new nobles, and even those who have been ennobled without being possessed of manors, do not pay the *taille*, or land-tax.

The owners of castles and lands, who composed the body of nobles in all countries, except in the republics, endeavoured as much as possible to enslave the inhabitants of their estates; but the great towns always opposed them in this, as the magistrates of these towns would upon no account be the fiefs or vassals of a count, a baron, or a bishop, and much less of an abbot, who arrogated to himself the same honours as a baron, or a count. The cities on the Rhine and the Rhone, and others of greater antiquity, such as Autun, Arles, and particularly Marseilles, flourished long before there were either lords or prelates. Their magistracy was several hundred years prior to the existence of fiefs; but the barons and castellans soon got the better, almost every where, of the citizens; and although the magistrates were not serfs of the lord,
I they

they were at least his burghers; and hence it comes that in many ancient charters we find mayors and sheriffs entitle themselves burghers of a count, or a bishop, and king's burghers. These burghers could not change their habitation without the permission of their lord, and paying a considerable fine. This kind of servitude is still in force in Germany.

In like manner as the fiefs were distinguished into frank fiefs, which owed no service to the lord paramount, and into great and little fiefs, which did owe service; so there were also *free burghers*, that is to say, those who purchased the right of exemption from all service to their lord; *grand burghers*, who were possessed of civil employs; and *petty burghers*, who in many respects were slaves.

This form of government, which had been raised by insensible degrees, fell to decay in like manner, in several countries, and in others was entirely abolished.

The kings of France, for example, began with ennobling the burghers, by conferring on them titles without lands. It has been pretended that amongst the collection of the charters of France, letters of nobility have been found, which were granted in 1095, to a burgher of Paris, named Eudes le Maire, by Philip I. and St. Louis undoubtedly must have ennobled his surgeon, la Brosse, since he made him his chamberlain. Philip III. who ennobled Raoul, his banker, was not therefore, as some writers have asserted, the first king who assumed the privilege of changing the condition of his subjects. In like manner, Philip the Fair bestowed the title of noble and esquire, *miles*, on the burgher Bertrand, and some others. This example was followed by all the other kings. In 1339, Philip of Valois ennobled Simon de Luci, president of the parliament, and his wife Nicole Taupin.

King John, in 1350, ennobled William de Dormans, his chancellor; for at that time the office of clerk, lawyer, or of the long robe, gave no rank among the nobility, notwithstanding that the clerks assumed the title

title of knights of the law, and bachelors of law. Thus we find John Pastourel, the king's advocate, ennobled, together with his wife Sédille, by Charles V. in 1354.

On the other hand, the kings of England created earls and barons, who had neither county nor barony. The emperors exercised the same privilege in Italy; and after their example, the possessors of great fiefs took the same liberty. We have even an instance of a count de Foix, who assumed the power of ennobling, and by this means of correcting the deficiency of fortune in birth. He granted a patent of nobility to one master Bertrand, his chancellor, and the descendants of this Bertrand called themselves noble; but it was at the option of the king and the rest of the nobles to acknowledge this title or not. Private lords of Orange, of Saluces, and many others, arrogated to themselves the same privilege.

In the reign of Charles VII. the military body of Frank-archers being exempted from the payment of the land-tax, thereupon assumed the titles of noble, and esquire, without any permission, and these titles were afterwards confirmed by time, which establishes and overturns all customs and privileges; and several great families in France are descendants of these archers, who made themselves noble, and merited that title on account of their having served their country.

The emperors not only created nobles without lands, but counts palatine also. This title was given to the doctors of the universities. The emperor, Charles IV. first introduced this custom, and Bartolus was the first on whom he conferred the title of count, which, however, did no more entitle the descendants of this Bartolus to a seat in the chapters, than it would those of a Frank-archer.

The popes, who pretended to be superior to the emperor, thought it concerned their dignity to create palatines and marquisses also; and the legates, who governed the provinces belonging to the holy see, were very lavish in conferring these titles; hence it comes

that there are so many more counts and marquisses in Italy than feudal lords.

In France, after Philip the Fair had established the court called parliament, the lords of fiefs, who had seats in that court, were obliged to avail themselves of the assistance of clerks, taken either from among the lower rank of people, or the bodies of free, grand, or petty burghers. These clerks quickly assumed the titles of knights and bachelors, in imitation of the nobility; but it is plain that the title of knight, which was given them by their clients, did not make them nobles at court, since the solicitor-general Pastourel, and the chancellor Dormans, judged it necessary to procure patents of nobility for themselves. The students of the universities took the title of bachelor, after passing one examination, and that of licentiate after the second, not daring to assume that of knight.

It seems to have been a great contradiction, that the professors of the law, who had a right to sit in judgment on the nobles, should not themselves enjoy the right of nobility. This however was really the case in all countries; but in France indeed, they enjoyed the same privileges of exemption as the nobles, during their own lives. It is true, that their rights did not entitle them to sit in the general assembly of the states, as lords of fiefs, to carry a bird on their fist, or to serve in person in the field, but only consisted in not paying the taille, and in being called *Messire**.

France has been always remarkable for the mutability of its laws and customs, the former of which have never been sufficiently clear and well understood. The bar was long in a fluctuating state. The courts of justice, which the French call parliaments, have frequently determined on the pretensions of the children of officers of the long robe to the right of nobility.

* This title, which in France is given to the presidents of the parliament, and to many other persons in respectable offices, answers nearly to the term of *worshipful* with us. T.

In 1540, the parliament of Paris decreed that the children of the king's advocate, John le Maitre, had a right to inherit as noble. In 1578 it gave a similar decree in favour of a chancellor, named Menager: but the civilians were divided in their opinion concerning these rights, which had been insensibly annexed to the long robe by custom. Louet, a counsellor of the parliament, pretended that the children of magistrates could inherit only as plebeians, and that none but grand-children were entitled by birth-right to the rank of gentlemen.

The court, however, did not regulate its opinion by that of the civilians; for, in 1582, Henry III. declared, by an edict, "That no one, except those of a noble house and family, should presume thenceforth to take the title of noble, or name of esquire."

Henry IV. shewed himself less strict and more just, in 1600, when in his edict concerning the regulation of the taxes, he declared (though in very vague terms) "That those who had served the nation in honourable posts, might begin to give a right of nobility to their posterity."

This dispute, of so many years standing, seemed happily terminated by Louis XIV. in the month of July 1644; but the event proved otherwise. We must here step a little aside from the order of time, in order to throw as much light upon this matter as possible. You will find in the age of Louis XIV. an account of the civil war that was excited in Paris during that prince's minority. It was during this war, and in the year 1644, that the parliament of Paris, the chamber of accounts, the court of aids, and all the other courts of the provinces, obtained "the privileges of nobles by birth, gentlemen, and barons of the kingdom," to descend to the children of counsellors and presidents, who have served twenty years, or have died in the exercise of their offices. By this edict their rank seemed ascertained.

Could any one then think that Louis XIV. would, in 1669, himself sitting in parliament, revoke these privileges, and only maintain all these officers of justice in the enjoyment of *their ancient privileges*, annulling all the rights of nobility which he had granted to them in 1644, and afterwards till this very year 1669.

Louis XIV. with all his power, has not been able to deprive such a number of citizens of a right which he bestowed on them under his own hand. It is not very easy for one man to oblige so many others to strip themselves of what they have looked upon as a part of their property. The edict of 1644 has therefore prevailed, and the courts of judicature have enjoyed the rights of nobility; the nation not chusing to contest this point with those whose office it is to judge the nation.

While the magistrates of the superior courts were thus disputing about their rank, from the year 1300, the burghers and officers of the towns were still in a more uncertain state. Charles V. called the Wise, with a view to gain the affections of the citizens of Paris, granted them several of the privileges of nobility, such as bearing coat-armour, and holding fiefs without paying the fine, which is called the tax of frank-fiefs; but Henry III. limited this privilege to the provost of the merchants, and four *echevins*, or sheriffs. The mayors and sheriffs of several towns in France enjoy the same rights, some by ancient customs, others by grant.

The most ancient grant of nobility given to the office of the pen in France, was that of the king's secretaries. These were originally what the secretaries of state are at present, and were called *clercs du secret*, or clerks of the privy council. As these secretaries wrote immediately under the king, and forwarded all his orders, it appeared but just that they should enjoy some mark of distinction; and the privilege of nobility, which they were entitled to after twenty years service, served as a model to the officers of the courts of judicature.

And here we principally perceive the extreme mutability of customs in France. The secretaries of state, who

who had originally no other right than that of signing dispatches, and who could not give any authenticity to these, but in virtue of their offices of clerks of the privy-council, or the king's private notaries, are even become ministers of state, and the powerful instruments of the will of an all-powerful monarch. They have assumed the title of Monseigneur, or my Lord, which was formerly given only to princes and to knights; while the king's secretaries are confined to the chancery, where their whole office consists in signing patents. The number of these useless officers has been augmented to three hundred, solely for the sake of raising money; and this shameful method has perpetuated the French nobility in upwards of six thousand families, whose chiefs successively bought their offices for a stipulated sum.

A prodigious number of citizens, of other denominations, such as bankers, surgeons, merchants, household servants to princes, and clerks in offices, have obtained letters of nobility, and in the course of a few generations, we find their descendants writing themselves in any public proceedings, most high and mighty lords. Titles of this kind have debased the ancient nobility, without doing any great honour to the new.

The personal service of the ancient knights and esquires being at length wholly laid aside, and the states general being no longer assembled, the privileges of both ancient and modern nobility are now limited to the payment of the poll-tax instead of the *taille*. Those, whose fathers were neither sheriffs nor counselors, nor ennobled persons, have been distinguished by appellations which are now become offensive, such as *villains* and *roturiers*.

The term *villain* comes from *villa*, a town or city, because formerly only nobles were lords of castles, and *roturier* from *ruptura terræ*, the breaking up of the land, husbandry; hence it has often happened, that a lieutenant-general of the army, a brave officer, covered with scars, has been obliged to pay the *taille*, or land-tax, while the son of a clerk in an office has enjoyed the

the same privileges as the first officers of the crown. This shameful abuse was not remedied till the year 1752, by M. d'Argenson, secretary at war, who has served the army more than any other minister, and to whose merit I the more readily do justice in this place, as he has been lately degraded.

This ridiculous multiplicity of nobles, without office, or real nobility, this debasing distinction between the useless noble, who pays nothing to the state, and the useful plebeian, who contributes his share to the taxes; those posts which are only obtained by money, and which confer the empty title of esquire, are abuses which we do not meet with in any other country, and are the effects of a kind of frantic desire in a government, to stamp a mark of degradation on the major part of the nation. In England, whoever is possessed of an estate of forty shillings a year in land, is *homo ingenuus*, a freeholder, a free-born Englishman, and has a right to the nomination of his representatives in parliament. Every one who is not of an handicraft trade is considered as a gentleman, and the law of England acknowledges no other nobles in the strictness of the term, than those who represent the ancient barons and peers of the realm, in the upper house.

There are many free states in which the privileges of birth are of no advantage, and in which they admit only those of citizen; and even in the city of Basil, no gentleman can hold any office in the republic, unless he relinquishes his privileges of a gentleman; and yet in every free state we find that the magistrates take the title of *nobilis*, noble. It is without dispute the most eminent nobility to have been at the head of a republic, from father to son; but such is the force of custom and prejudice, that four hundred years possession of so refined a dignity, would not exempt the bearer in France from paying the land-tax, nor gain him admittance into the most inconsiderable chapter in Germany.

These customs are a picture of vanity and inconstancy; but happily it is the least melancholy part of the history of human kind.

C H A P. XCIX.

Of Tournaments.

THE tournaments, so long famous throughout christendom, and so often anathematized, were games far more noble than the wrestling, the throwing of the disque, or the races of the ancient Greeks, and far less barbarous than the fights of gladiators among the Romans. Our tournaments bore no resemblance to those ancient diversions, but were much of the same kind with the military exercises so common in old times, and the games which we find described in Homer. These warlike games first took their rise in Italy, in the reign of Theodoric, who suppressed the gladiators in the fifth century, not by a prohibitory edict, but by reproaching the Romans with this barbarous custom, in order that they might learn politeness and humanity of a Goth. After this there were frequently military games in Italy, and particularly in the kingdom of Lombardy, as also petty combats, called *battaglie*, which are still kept up in the cities of Venice and Pisa.

This custom was soon adopted by other nations. Nithard relates, that in the year 870, the sons of Louis the Weak, celebrated their reconciliation by solemn tilts, since called tournaments; and in which says he, "*Ex utraque parte, alter in alterum veloci cursu ruebant.*" "Either party ran at each other full speed."

The emperor Henry, the Fowler, celebrated his coronation in 920 by one of these military entertainments, in which the parties fought on horseback. The preparations were as splendid as could be in a country so poor, that it had not one fortified town but what had been built by the Romans along the banks of the Rhine.

This custom became general in France, England, Spain, and among the Moorish nations. It is well known

known that Geoffry de Preuilli, a knight of Touraine, compiled certain laws, to be observed in the celebration of these games towards the end of the eleventh century. Some pretend that the name of tournament came from the city of Tours, for the combatants did not turn in these exercises as they did in the chariot-races among the Greeks and Romans. But it is more probable, that tournament was derived from the sword with a turned point, *ensis torneaticus*, in law-latin, because in these games they were not permitted to strike with any other pointed weapons but the lance.

These games were, at their first institution, called by the French, *emprijes*, *pardons d'armes*, the word *pardon* shewed that the combat was not to be mortal. These games were also called *bebourdis*, from the name of an armour, or breast plate, with which their horses were covered. René of Anjou, king of Sicily and Jerusalem, and duke of Lorrain, though not in possession of any part of those dominions, who was very fond of making verses and tournaments, made also several new rules and orders to be observed in those combats.

“Whosoever, says he, in his laws, will hold a tournament or joust, must be a prince, or at least a high baron.” The person who meant to hold the tournament sent a herald with a sword to the prince whom he invited, desiring him to appoint judges of the field.

“Tournaments, says this good king René, may be of abundant utility, inasmuch as it may happen that some young knight or esquire, by his achievements therein, may acquire the good graces or greater affection of the lady whom he serveth.”

Then follow the several ceremonies to be observed in these exercises, such as the hanging the armorial ensigns or banners of the contending knights or esquires at the windows, or on the galleries round the list.

According to the laws of king René, every thing was done in honour of the ladies. They were to examine the arms of the combatants, and to distribute the prizes to the victors; and if any knight or esquire, who was a candidate at these tournaments had spoken ill of any lady,

the other candidates beat him with their swords till the ladies cried out *grace*, or enough ! or else he was placed astride on the rails that went round the list, as a soldier is now set upon the wooden horse.

Besides these tournaments, there was also the *pas d'armes*, and of this amusement king René was likewise the law-giver. The *pas d'armes* of the dragon's throat, held near Chinon in 1446, was very famous. Some time after, that of the *chateau de la joyeuse garde*, or the castle of the joyous guard, acquired still greater reputation. In these combats the trial of skill was to defend the entrance of a castle, or the passage of a high road. René had much better have tried his skill to enter into Sicily or Lorraine. The device of this gallant prince was a chaffing-dish full of live coals, with these words, "*Porté d'ardent desir*, impelled by ardent desire ;" this ardent desire, however, was not for the recovery of the dominions which he had lost, but for the charms of mademoiselle Gui de Laval, with whom he was in love, and whom he married after the death of his wife Isabella of Lorraine.

These ancient tournaments first gave rise to armorial bearings, about the beginning of the twelfth century : and whatever of that nature is supposed to have existed before that time is evidently fictitious, as are likewise the pretended laws of the knights of the round table, so much talked of in romance. Every knight who presented himself at the list with his beaver or helmet closed for combat, had some kind of symbol or device painted on his shield, or coat of arms. Hence came the knights of the eagle, of the lion, &c. names so famous in the old writers of romance. The terms of blazonry, which at present seem such an absurd and barbarous jargon, were then words in common use. Flame colour was called *gules* ; blue, *sinople* or *azure* ; a stake was called a *pale*, and a band or belt, a *fess*, *fascia*.

If there was ever any reason for encouraging these warlike sports, it was in the times of the crusades, when the exercise of arms was consecrated by necessity ;

and yet it was at this very period that the popes thought proper to prohibit them, and to anathematize an image of war, when they themselves were perpetually stirring up real ones. Among others, Nicholas III. the same pontiff who afterwards advised the massacre of the Sicilian vespers, excommunicated all those who had engaged in, or were even present at a tournament held in France by Philip the Bold in 1279. But there were other popes who approved of these combats; and king John of France entertained pope Urban V. with one of these shews, when, after his return from his captivity in England, he went to take up the cross at Avignon, on the mad project of fighting against the Turks, instead of exerting his endeavours to repair the disasters of his own kingdom.

It was a very long time before tournaments were admitted into the Greek empire. The Greeks in general held all the customs of the West in contempt; they despised the badge of coat-armour, and treated the science of heraldry as ridiculous. At length, in 1326, the young emperor Andronicus, having espoused a princess of the house of Savoy, some young gentlemen of that country gave the diversion of a tournament at Constantinople, and the Greeks from that time became accustomed to these military exercises. But the Turks were not to be resisted by tournaments; this required well disciplined armies, and an able government, two things which the Greeks were hardly ever masters of.

The custom of holding tournaments was adopted in every part of Europe. One of the most solemn, was that which was held at Boulogne in 1309, on the occasion of the marriage of Isabella of France with king Edward II. of England. Edward III. held two very fine ones afterwards in London. There was even one held at Paris in the year 1415, during the unfortunate reign of Charles VI. After this came those of René of Anjou, of which we have already spoken. They continued to be very frequent till the death of Henry II. of France, who, as we all know, was killed at one of these diversions in the palace of the Tournelles in the year

year 1559. This accident, one would imagine, should have put a final stop to them.

But the idle life of the great, joined to habit and a natural inclination, revived these bloody amusements at Orleans in less than a year after the tragical end of Henry II. Here prince Henry de Bourbon Montpensier was the victim by a fall from his horse, which cost him his life. This put a total stop to tournaments. But there still remained a faint image of them in the *pas d'armes* held by Charles IX. and Henry III. a year after the massacre of St. Bartholomew; for in those days festivals and proscriptions always went hand-in-hand. This *pas d'armes* was not attended with any danger, as the combatants fought only with blunt weapons. There was no tournament held on the marriage of the duke de Joyeuse in 1581: the word tournament is therefore improperly applied by l'Etoile in the account he gives us of these diversions in his journal. The nobility did not fight at all; and what he calls a tournament was only a kind of warlike ballet, exhibited in the gardens of the Louvre by hired performers; it was a shew given to the court, and not given by the court itself. The games which afterwards went by the name of tournaments were only carousals.

We may therefore date the suppression of tournaments from the year 1560. With them expired the ancient spirit of chivalry, which appeared no more afterwards but in romance. This spirit prevailed greatly till the reign of Francis I. and the emperor Charles V.—Philip II. who seldom stirred out of his own palace, encouraged no merit in Spain, but that of a blind submission to his will. After the death of Henry II. France was plunged in fanaticism, and desolated by religious wars. Germany divided between the Roman Catholic, Lutheran, and Calvinist factions, forgot the ancient customs of chivalry: and in Italy they were lost in the spirit of intrigue.

The *pas d'armes*, the combats of the lists, and the imitation of the ancient tournaments, every where abolished, were succeeded by the bull-fights in Spain, and

carousals in France, Italy and Germany. It would be superfluous to give a description of these games in this place; it will be sufficient to refer the reader to the *Age of Louis XIV.* where we have given an account of a grand carousal given by that prince. The last which was held, was that at Berlin in 1750, which was finely executed, and at which the brothers of the king of Prussia distinguished themselves greatly by their skill and address. All these military games begin now to be entirely out of use; and of the many exercises which formerly rendered the body so robust and agile, none now remain but that of hunting, and even this is greatly neglected of late by the crowned heads of Europe. There have been revolutions in pleasures as well as in every other thing.

C H A P. C.

Of D U E L S.

THE education of the nobility greatly encouraged the practice of duelling, which had its beginning with our modern monarchies, and has been of so long continuance. The custom of deciding the merits of a cause by a legal combat was known only to the Christians of the West. We hear of no duels among those of the eastern church: and the ancient nations were altogether strangers to this barbarous practice. Cæsar indeed tells us, in his Commentaries, that two of his centurions, who had been always jealous of, and at enmity with each other, decided their quarrel by a challenge, but this challenge was to shew which of them should perform the most valiant feats in battle. One of them, after having slain a great number of the enemy with his own hand, being at length wounded and thrown to the ground himself, his competitor stepped in and rescued him. Such were the duels of the Romans.

The

The most ancient examples of duels commanded by the sovereign is in the law of Gondebaut, the Burgundian, a German by family, who had usurped the dukedom of Burgundy. This method of judgment was established throughout all the West. The old Catalan law quoted by the learned du Cange, and the German and Bavarian laws, mention several cases in which the parties were required to determine the dispute by single combat.

In the assizes held by the crusaders at Jerusalem, they expressed themselves as follows, "*Le garant que l'on lieve, si come es par pu doit repondre à qui li lieve; tu mens*" "*Et te rendrai mort ó recreant, Et vessi mon gage*"—"The party accused shall say to his accuser, thou liest, and thou shalt die by my hand, recreant, and here is my gage."

The ancient Norman customary says, "*Plainte de meurtre doit être faite, Et si l'accusé nie, il en offre gage—et bataille li doit être ottroyée par justice.*"—"Complaint of murder must be made, and if the accused denies the charge, he offers challenge; in which case the law must grant him combat."

It is evident by these laws, that a man accused of one murder had a right to commit two. Even civil matters were often terminated by these bloody issues. If two parties disputed an inheritance with each other, he who had the best sword was held to have the best right; and differences between fellow citizens were decided like those between nations, by force of arms.

This law procedure experienced its changes like all other human institutions, whether wise or foolish. St. Louis enacted that an esquire, if accused by a peasant, might fight on horseback, and that a peasant accused by an esquire must fight on foot. He exempts youths under twenty-one years of age from the laws of duelling, and old persons above sixty.

The women and priests had the naming of the champions who were to cut each other's throats in their name; and the fortune and reputation of a family depended

depended on a lucky choice. It sometimes happened, that churchmen themselves offered and accepted combat, and fought within enclosed ground. By the constitutions of William the Conqueror, it appears that no clerk or abbot could engage in single combat without permission first had of their bishops, "*Si clericus duellum sine episcopi licentia suscepit, &c.*"

By the laws of St. Louis, and other precedents quoted by du Cange, it appears that the conquered were sometimes hanged, and sometimes beheaded or dismembered. These were called laws of honour, and authorized under the seal of this kingly saint, who is said to have wanted to abolish this custom, worthy only of savages.

Justice was so much improved at the time of Louis the Young, that he issued an order in 1168, that single combat should be allowed only in cases where the sum exceeded five crowns, "*quinque solidos.*"

Philip the Fair published a large code of duels. If the appellant had a mind to fight by party, and name a champion to defend his cause, he was to say, "Our sovereign lord, by legal essoin of my body, (i.e. through bodily weakness or disease) I claim and demand to have such a gentleman for my champion, who may in my presence, if so I can, or in my absence, with the help of God, of our holy Lady, and my Lord St. George, do true and loyal service in my name, and at my cost, &c."

The two adversaries, or their champions in their stead, appeared on a day appointed, within a list eighty paces in length, and forty wide, attended by the sergeants at arms. They were to come "*mounted on horseback with their vizers down, their shields slung across their shoulders, their faulcheons in their hands, and their swords and daggers girt to their sides.*" They were enjoined to bear a crucifix, or an image of the virgin Mary, or of some saint in their banners. The heralds at arms made the spectators range themselves on the outside of the lists on foot. No person was allowed to be present on horseback, under pain of losing

losing his horse if a nobleman, and if a burgher of losing one of his ears.

The marshal of the field, assisted by a priest, swore the two combatants on a crucifix, that their right was good, and that they made use of no enchanted arms, taking St. George to witness, and renouncing heaven, if they spoke false. These blasphemous ceremonies over, the marshal cried out with a loud voice, "Let them go on;" and then, throwing down a glove, the combatants went to work, and the arms of the vanquished belonged to the marshal.

Nearly the same kind of forms was observed in England. But in Germany they differed considerably. We read in the Theatre of Honour, and in several other ancient chronicles, that, in general, the town of Hall in Suabia was the place for these combats. The two parties applied to the magistrates of Suabia for permission to enter the lists. On these occasions they assigned to each combatant a godfather and a confessor; the people chanted a *libera**; a bier surrounded by torches, and designed to receive the lifeless corpse of the vanquished person, was placed at one end of the lists. The same ceremonies were observed at Wurtzburg.

There were a great number of these close combats all over Europe till the thirteenth century. From the laws of these combats came the proverbial sayings, "*Les morts ont tort; Les battus payent l'amende.*"—"The dead are always in the wrong;" and, "he that is beaten must pay all costs."

The French parliaments sometimes ordered these combats, in the same manner as they now order proofs to be produced in writing, or by verbal evidence. During the reign of Philip of Valois, in 1343, the parliament came to a resolution that there was a lawful challenge, and a necessity of mortal combat, between the chevalier Dubois and the chevalier de Vervins, because the latter had endeavoured to persuade Philip de

* *Libera nos, Domine*, a hymn in the Romish ritual. T.

Valois, that "Dubois had bewitched his highness the king of France."

The duel between Legris and Carrouge, ordered by parliament in the reign of Charles VI. is famous even to this day. The dispute was, whether Legris had lain with Carrouge's wife against her consent, or not?

Many years after this, namely, in 1442, in a solemn cause between the knight Patarin and the esquire Tachon, the parliament declared the affair in question did not require trial by combat; inasmuch as a peremptory accusation or charge, independent of all witnesses, was requisite to warrant a legal order for a duel.

A charge of this kind happened in the year 1454, in the person of one John Picard, who was accused of having defiled his own daughter, and was held by a decree to fight against his son-in-law, who was his accuser. The Theatre of Honour and Chivalry does not tell us the issue of this affair; but be it as it might, the parliament ordered a charge of incest to be made good by parricide.

The bishops, and abbots likewise, in imitation of the parliaments and king's council, ordered close combats within their jurisdictions. Ives de Chartres reproaches the archbishop of Sens, and the bishop of Orleans, with having authorised too great a number of duels of this kind in civil matters. Geoffry du Maine, bishop of Angers, obliged the monks of St. Serge, in 1100, to prove by combat their right to certain tithes, to which they laid claim; and the champion for the monks, who was a sturdy fellow, got the cause for them by soundly cudgelling his adversary.

Under the last race of the dukes of Burgundy, the burghers of the towns of Flanders enjoyed the privilege of proving their claims with a buckler and club. They anointed their doublets with grease, because they had heard that, anciently, the *athletæ* rubbed themselves with oil; they next dipped their hands
into

into a tub or bucket of ashes, and then putting some sugar or honey in their mouths, they fought till one of them dropt, and he that was overcome was hanged.

It would be too tedious to give a list of all the combats of this kind, ordered by different sovereigns. King Francis I. solemnly authorised two, and his son, Henry II. ordered two others. The first of those which Henry ordered was that between Jarnac and la Chataigneraye, in 1547. La Chataigneraye had accused Jarnac with laying with his mother-in-law; and the latter denied the charge: but was this a reason for a king, with the advice of his council, to order two of his subjects to butcher one another in his presence? Such, however, were the manners of the times. Each of the champions swore upon the holy gospel, that he fought in the cause of truth, and that "He carried" about him neither spells, charms, nor incantations." La Chataigneraye dying of his wounds, Henry II. made an oath never more to order duels; and yet the next year he issued letters patent in his privy council, enjoining two young gentlemen to fight within the lists at Sedan, under the inspection of the marshal de la Mark, prince of Sedan. Henry thought he had not violated his oath, because he ordered the parties to go and murder each other out of his kingdom. The court of Lorraine opposed in form this honour conferred on the marshal de la Mark, and sent a protest to Sedan, alledging that all duels between the Rhine and the Maese were, according to the laws of the empire, to be fought only by order, and in the presence, of the sovereign of Lorraine. Notwithstanding this, the field was marked out in Sedan. The motive of this order of Henry II. issued in his privy council, was that one of these gentlemen, named Dagùeres, had put his hand into the breeches of a young man named Fendilles. Fendilles being wounded in the duel, confessed the accusation to have been false; upon which he was thrown out of the lists by the heralds at arms, and had his weapons broken: this was

one of the punishments inflicted on the vanquished party. At present we can hardly conceive how so ridiculous an affair could have been thought worthy of being decided by a legal combat.

We ought not to confound, however, these duels, which were considered as judgments of the Almighty, with the single combats between the chiefs of two armies, or the knights of two adverse parties. These latter were feats of arms, and military exploits, which have ever been in use among all nations.

It is hard to determine, whether we ought to rank several cartels of defiance between king and king, and prince and prince, in the number of legal duels, or among the exploits of chivalry: there have been instances of both kinds.

When Charles of Anjou, brother to St. Louis, and Peter of Arragon, defied each other to combat, after the Sicilian vespers, they agreed to stake the justice of their cause upon a single combat, with the permission of pope Martin IV. as we are told by John Baptist Caraffa, in his history of Naples. Philip the Bold, king of France, appointed Bourdeaux for the place of combat. Nothing could more resemble the old legal duels. Charles of Anjou came to the rendezvous the morning of the day appointed, and took out an action of default against his adversary, who did not arrive till the same evening. Peter, in return, took out another action of default against Charles, for not having waited for him. This singular challenge would have been ranked in the number of legal combats, if these two kings had had as great an inclination to fight with, as to brave each other. The duel which Edward III. proposed to Philip of Valois comes within the rules of chivalry. Philip refused it, alledging that a vassal could not challenge his lord-paramount; but afterwards, when the vassal had defeated the army of his lord, Philip offered him combat; and Edward III. who was then conqueror, refused it, saying that he was too wise to put to the hazard of a single combat what he had gained by many battles.

The

The emperor Charles V. and Francis I. king of France, defied each other, sent mutual challenges, gave each other the *lie in the throat*, but never fought. There is not a single instance of one king fighting against another in single combat; but the number of knights who lavished their blood in these adventures is incredible.

We have already taken notice of the challenge of a duke of Bourbon, who to keep himself from idleness, proposed a combat to extremity in honour of the ladies.

One of the most famous challenges is that of John de Werchin, a knight of great renown, and grand bailiff of Hainault, who caused a notice to be fixed up in all the capital cities of Europe, that he would fight to extremity, either single, or himself with other five persons, with sword, lance, and battle axe, "With the help of God, the Holy Virgin, St. George, and his lady."

The combat was to be in a village of Flanders, named Conchy; but no person appearing to enter the lists with this Fleming, he made a vow to go in search of adventures throughout France and Spain, constantly armed cap-a-pee; after which he went and made an offering of his staff at the shrine of St. James in Galicia. By this you may see that the original of Quixotism was in Flanders.

The most horrible duel that was ever proposed, and which nevertheless was the most excusable, was that of Arnout, or Arnold, the last duke of Gueldres, whose territories fell to the Burgundy branch of the house of France, afterwards belonged to the Austro-Spanish branch, and one part of which is now free.

Adolphus, son to this duke Arnold, took up arms against his father, in 1470, in the time of Charles the Rash, duke of Burgundy; and this Adolphus declared publicly, in the presence of Charles, that his father had been in possession of the dukedom long enough, and that he was determined to enjoy it in his turn, and that, if his father would accept of a small pension of three thousand florins, he would give it him willingly.

Charles, who before his misfortunes was very powerful, cited both father and son to appear before him; the father, though old and infirm, threw down his pledge of combat, and demanded permission of the duke of Burgundy to fight his son in his court. The son accepted the challenge, but duke Charles would not permit the combat; and the father having with great justice disinherited his unnatural and rebellious son, and given his dominions to Charles, that unfortunate prince lost them all, together with his own, and his life, in a war still more unjust than any of the duels we have been relating.

That which contributed the most to the suppression of this custom, was the new method of fighting introduced into the armies. King Henry IV. decried the use of lances at the battle of Ivry; and at present, when the superiority of fire determines the fate of the day, a knight would have but an indifferent chance to present himself with his lance couched in the rest, before the front of a battalion. Military courage consisted formerly in keeping firm, and armed at all points, on a coach horse, who was also in a manner cased with steel. In our days, it consists in marching slowly up to the mouths of an hundred pieces of cannon, that sometimes sweep away whole ranks at a discharge.

When the legal duels became out of use, and the cartels of chivalry still more so, duels between private persons began to rage with great fury; and every one assumed of his own accord, upon the most trivial occasions, that licence which was formerly wont to be demanded of parliaments, bishops, and kings.

Duels were much less frequent when courts of justice ordered them in a solemn manner; but when they came to be forbidden, they encreased out of number. They soon came to have seconds in these combats, in like manner as in those in the times of chivalry.

One of the most famous we meet with in history, is that of Cailus, Maugiron, and Livarot, against An-traguet,

traguët, Riberac, and Schomberg, in the reign of Henry III. in that part of Paris which is now called the *Place Royale*, and where formerly stood the palace of Tournelles. After that, hardly a day passed without some duel happening; and this madness was carried so far, that there were companies of gend'armes, into which no person was admitted who had not fought at least one duel, or would not take an oath to fight one before the end of the year. This horrid custom continued till the reign of Louis XIV.

C H A P. CI.

Of Charles VIII. and the State of Europe when he undertook the Conquest of Naples.

LOUIS XI. left his son Charles VIII. a youth only fourteen years of age, of a weak constitution, and an uncultivated understanding, in possession of the finest and most powerful kingdom in Europe. But he left him at the same time a civil war, the almost inseparable companion of minorities. The king indeed was not a minor according to the laws of Charles V. but he was under age according to the law of nature. His eldest sister Anne, wife of the duke of Bourbon Beaujeau, was by her father's will entrusted with the regency, and is said to have been worthy of this distinction. Louis duke of Orleans, the first prince of the blood, who was afterwards that very king Louis XII. whose memory is so dear to France, began with shewing himself the scourge of the state, to which he afterwards behaved himself as a father. On the one hand, his quality of first prince of the blood, so far from procuring him any share in the government, did not even give him the precedency over the other peers more ancient than himself. On the other, it seemed at any rate very odd, that a woman, whom the law excludes from the throne, should rule the state under another

another name. Louis, duke of Orleans, excited by ambition (which excites even the most virtuous) therefore engaged in a civil war against his sovereign, in order to be his guardian.

It was then the parliament of Paris perceived the influence which it was one day likely to acquire in the case of minorities. The duke of Orleans addressed himself to this court to obtain a decree for changing the administration. The first president, La Vaquerie, made answer that neither the finances, nor the administration of the realm, were points that belonged to the jurisdiction of the parliament, but to the states general, whom the court of parliament does not represent.

We may perceive by this answer that Paris was then quiet, and that the parliament was in the interest of madame de Beaujeu. The civil war was carried on in 1488 the provinces, and especially in Britany, where the old duke Francis II. sided with the duke of Orleans. At length both parties came to an engagement near St. Aubin in Britany. Here we are to observe, that in the duke of Orleans's army there were four or five hundred English, notwithstanding the troubles with which their own country was at that time exhausted. Whenever an opportunity has offered of attacking France, the English have seldom been neuter. Louis de Trimouille, a great general, defeated the rebels, and took their chief the duke of Orleans prisoner, who was afterwards his sovereign. We may reckon him the third of the Capetian kings taken in battle, but not the last. The duke was confined near three years in the tower of 1491 Bourges, till Charles VIII. went himself in person to set him at liberty. The manners of the French at that time were much milder than those of the English, who amidst the distractions of the civil war, generally put their vanquished enemies to death by the hands of the executioner.

The peace and grandeur of France were cemented by the marriage of Charles VIII. who at length compelled the old duke of Britany to give him his daughter and

and his dominions. The princess Anne of Britany, one of the finest women of her time, was in love with the duke of Orleans, who still had youth on his side, and was withal a most graceful person. Thus by this civil war he lost both his liberty and his mistress.

In Europe the marriages of princes frequently decide the fate of nations. King Charles VIII. who in his father's life-time might have married Mary the heiress of the house of Burgundy, had it still in his power to marry the daughter of this Mary, and of Maximilian king of the Romans; and Maximilian on his side, the widower of Mary of Burgundy, had good reason to flatter himself with the hopes of obtaining the princess Anne of Britany. He had actually married her by proxy; and the count of Nassau, in the name of the king of the Romans, had put one leg into the princess's bed, according to the custom of those times. But this did not hinder the king of France from concluding his marriage. He obtained the princess, and for her portion Britany, which was afterwards reduced to a province of France.

This kingdom was then at its highest pitch of glory; and indeed nothing but the great number of mistakes its princes committed, could have hindered them from being the arbiters of Europe.

You may remember how the last count of Provence bequeathed that country by will to Louis XI. This count, in whom ended the house of Anjou, took the title of king of the two Sicilies, which his family had long since lost; a title which he conveyed to Louis XI. at the same time that he made him a real donation of Provence. Charles VIII. resolving not to wear an empty title, soon prepared every thing necessary for the conquest of Naples, and to establish his dominion in Italy. We must here take a view of the state of Europe at the end of the fifteenth century; the time when these events took place.

C H A P. CII.

State of Europe at the End of the fifteenth Century.—Of Germany, and principally of Spain.—Of the unfortunate Reign of Henry IV. surnamed the Impotent.—Of Isabella and Ferdinand.—The taking of Grenada.—The Jews and Moors persecuted.

1493 **T**HE emperor Frederick III. of the house of Austria, was lately dead: he left the empire to his son Maximilian, who in his father's life time had been chosen king of the Romans. But these kings of the Romans had no longer any power in Italy; the authority they had in Germany was no greater than that of the doge at Venice; and, upon the whole, the house of Austria was far from being formidable. In vain do they still shew the following epitaph at Vienna: "Here lies the pious and august emperor Frederick III. sovereign of Christendom, king of Hungary, Dalmatia, Croatia, archduke of Austria, &c." it serves only to shew the vanity of inscriptions. He never possessed any thing belonging to Hungary, except the crown adorned with some jewels, which he always kept in his cabinet, refusing to send them either to his pupil Ladislaus, who was king of that country, or to those who were afterwards chosen by the Hungarians, and who fought against the Turks. He was hardly master of one half of the province of Austria; his cousins had the rest; and as to the title of sovereign of Christendom, it is easy to see whether he deserved it. His son Maximilian had, besides his father's demesnes, the administration of the territories belonging to his wife Mary of Burgundy, in the name of his son Philip the Handsome. Every one knows that he was called *Massimiliano pochi danari*, *Maximilian with little money*; a surname that by no means proves him to have been a powerful prince.

England which was still in a rude and unpolished state, after having been long laid waste by the civil wars

wars between the white and red roses, as we shall presently relate more at large, was now beginning to recover itself under king Henry VII. who after the example of Louis XI. of France, humbled the barons and favoured the liberties of the people.

In Spain the Christian princes had been constantly divided. The race of Henry Transmare, a bastard and usurper (since we must call things by their right name) was still upon the throne of Castile, when an usurpation of a more extraordinary kind gave rise to the Spanish grandeur.

Henry IV. one of the descendants of Transmare, who began his unhappy reign in 1454, was a voluptuous prince. There has never been a court entirely abandoned to debauchery, without experiencing some revolution, or being at least disturbed by insurrections. His wife Donna Juana, whom I thus distinguish both from her daughter Joan, and from the other princesses of that name, was a daughter of a king of Portugal, and carried on her amours without any sort of disguise. Few women ever had less regard for decorum in their intrigues. King Henry IV. passed his days with his wife's gallants, and these did the same with the king's mistresses. The whole court seemed to agree in setting the nation an example of the greatest effeminacy and licentiousness. The government being so weak, the malecontents, who are generally the most numerous at all times and in all countries, grew to be a formidable party in Castile. This kingdom had the same form of government as that which long obtained in France, England, Germany, and the several monarchies of Europe. The vassals shared the supreme authority. The bishops were not sovereign princes as in Germany; but they were lords, and great vassals, as in France.

An archbishop of Toledo, whose name was Carillo, and several other prelates, headed the faction against the king. The same disorders broke out in Spain as had afflicted France in the reign of Louis the Weak, and disturbed the peace of Germany under so many emperors. We shall see similar factions revived in France

under Henry III. and spreading desolation through England in the reign of Charles I.

1465 The rebels growing powerful, deposed their king in effigy. Never was the like ceremony thought of before. A great stage was erected on the plains of Avila: and on this stage was placed a statue of wood, representing don Henry in his royal robes. The sentence of deposition was read to this statue. The archbishop of Toledo stripped him of his crown, another of his sword, another of his sceptre, and a younger brother of Henry, named Alphonso, was declared king on the same spot. This farce was attended with all the horrors of civil war. The death of the young prince, to whom the conspirators had conveyed the crown, did not put an end to the troubles. The archbishop and his party declared the king impotent; at the very time when he was surrounded with mistresses; and by a proceeding, unprecedented in any state, they determined that his daughter Joan was a bastard, born in adultery, and incapable of reigning. The bastard Transamare, a rebel against his lawful king, had been formerly acknowledged king himself, and now they dethroned their lawful sovereign, and declared his daughter illegitimate, though publicly born of the queen, and acknowledged by her father as his own child.

Several grandees pretended to the regal dignity; but the rebels resolved to acknowledge Isabella, the king's sister, and only seventeen years old, for their sovereign, sooner than submit to any of their equals; preferring rather to weaken the state in the name of a young princess, who, as yet, had neither authority nor influence, than to chuse themselves a master.

The archbishop having therefore levied war against his king, in the infant's name, continued it in the name of the infanta; so that the king had no other way to extricate himself from his troubles, and continue upon the throne, than by concluding one of the most ignominious treaties that ever was signed by a sovereign. 1468 He acknowledged his sister Isabella as his only legitimate heir, contrary to the rights of his daughter Joan;

Joan ; and upon this condition the rebels left him the name of a king. In the same manner Charles VI. king of France, had agreed to disinherit his own son.

In order to accomplish this scandalous transaction, it was incumbent upon them to chuse such a husband for Isabella, as should be able to support her cause. They cast their eye on Ferdinand, heir apparent to the crown of Arragon, a prince nearly of the same age as Isabella. The archbishop married them privately ; and this marriage, though concluded under such unfavourable auspices, proved the foundation of the Spanish greatness. At first it created dissensions, civil broils, fraudulent conventions, and false reconciliations, which are pro-¹⁴⁶⁹ ductive of greater hatred. After one of these treaties of reconciliation, Henry was seized with a violent illness, at an entertainment to which he had been invited by some of his late enemies, and he died very ¹⁴⁷⁴ soon after.

In vain did he leave his kingdom at his death to his daughter Joan ; in vain did he swear that she was his lawful issue ; neither his oath upon his death-bed, nor his wife's oath, could prevail against Isabella and Ferdinand, surnamed afterwards the Catholic, king of Arragon and Sicily. They lived together, not like two married persons, whose goods are common to each other under the direction of the husband ; but as two monarchs strictly allied. They neither loved, nor hated each other ; they met but seldom ; they had their privy councils separate ; they often entertained a mutual jealousy in regard to the administration, though the queen was more jealous on account of the infidelity of her husband, who filled all the great offices of state with his bastards. However, they were inseparably united in regard to their interests, acting constantly on the same principles, having ever in their mouths words of religion and piety, while their hearts were entirely actuated by ambition. Joan, the right heiress of Castile, was not able to withstand their joint forces. Her uncle don Alphonso, king of Portugal, took up arms in favour of his niece, whom he intended to marry. But

the conclusion of all these efforts and troubles, was that the unhappy princess, who had been designed for a throne, was condemned to spend the remainder of her days in a convent.

Never was injustice better coloured or more successful; never was it more justified by a daring and prudent conduct. Isabella and Ferdinand established such a power in Spain, as had never been known in that kingdom, since the restoration of the Christians. The Moors were now in possession only of Granada, and drew near to their ruin in that part of Europe, while the Turks seemed on the point of subduing the other. The Christians had lost Spain in the beginning of the eighth century, by their mutual discords and divisions; and the same cause drove the Moors at length out of that kingdom.

Boabdilla, nephew to Alboacen king of Granada, had rebelled against his uncle. Ferdinand the Catholic did not fail to embrace this opportunity of fomenting the civil war, and of supporting the nephew against the uncle, in order to weaken both parties. Soon after the death of Alboacen, he attacked his ally Boabdilla with the joint forces of Castile and Arragon. His arms were six years employed in the conquest of the Mahometan kingdom. At length he besieged Granada; the siege lasted eight months, and Isabella went thither in person to enjoy the triumph. King Boabdilla surrendered on such conditions as shewed he was still able to make a defence. For it was stipulated that the Spaniards should neither meddle with the goods, nor with the laws, liberties, or religion of the Moors; that even their prisoners should be returned without ransom; and the Jews included in the treaty should enjoy the same privileges. Upon these conditions Boabdilla marched out of his capital, and delivered up the keys to Ferdinand and Isabella, who for the last time treated him as a king.

Cotemporary writers make mention that this prince shed tears as he turned his face towards the walls of Granada; a city built near five hundred years before
by

by the Mahometans; a city populous, and abounding in riches; a city, in short, adorned with that vast palace of the Moorish kings, in which were the finest baths in Europe, whose numerous halls, with arched roofs, were supported by an hundred columns of alabaster. The luxury which he so much regretted, was probably the cause of his ruin: to conclude the scene, he went and ended his days in Africa.

Ferdinand was considered in Europe as the avenger of the cause of religion, and the deliverer of his country. From that time he was called king of Spain; and indeed being master of Castile in right of his wife, of Granada by conquest, and of Arragon by birth, he wanted only Navarre, which he afterwards invaded. He had great disputes with France about Cerdagne and Roussillon, which had been mortgaged to Louis XI. It is easy to judge, whether as king of Sicily, he did not look with a jealous eye on the preparations which Charles the VIIIth was making for his expedition into Italy, in order to dispossess the house of Arragon, at that time established on the throne of Naples.

We shall soon see the effects of so natural a jealousy. But before we consider the quarrels of kings, you will perhaps not be displeased to observe the fate of these people. You see that Ferdinand and Isabella did not find Spain in the state it was afterwards under Charles V. and Philip II. A mixture of ancient Visigoths, Vandals, Africans, Jews and Aborigines, had laid waste the country about which they contested; it grew fruitful only in the hands of Mahometans. When the Moors were subdued, they tilled the land for their conquerors, so that the Spanish Christians subsisted intirely by the labour of their ancient enemies. Those Christians had neither manufactures nor commerce, they were acquainted only with very few even of the conveniences of life, they had hardly any furniture in their houses, no inns upon the great roads, no accommodations in the towns; they were long strangers to fine linen; and even coarse linen was very scarce. All their foreign and inland trade was carried on by Jews, who were
grown

grown necessary to a nation that understood nothing but the art of war.

Towards the end of the fourteenth century, that is, 1492, when an enquiry was set on foot into the cause of the poverty of Spain, it was found that the Jews, by trade and usury, had drawn all the money of the country into their own hands. They reckoned in Spain above an hundred and fifty thousand of that odious but necessary race. Several of the grandees who had nothing left but their titles, married into Jewish families, to retrieve the losses occasioned by their former extravagance: and in this they were so much the less scrupulous, as the Moors and Christians had long been accustomed to intermarry. It was debated in the council of Ferdinand and Isabella, in what manner they should free themselves from the silent tyranny of the Jews, after having shaken off the yoke of the Arabian conquerors. At length the resolution was taken in 1492, to strip and banish them. They were allowed only six months to dispose of their effects, which they were obliged to sell at an undervalue. They were forbid upon pain of death, to carry away either gold, silver or precious stones. Thirty thousand Jewish families withdrew from Spain; this makes an hundred and fifty thousand persons, reckoning five to a family. Some passed over to Africa, others retired to Portugal and France, and several went back, pretending to embrace Christianity. They had been exiled, in order to take possession of their riches; they were received again, because they brought riches with them: and it was chiefly against them, that the tribunal of the inquisition was erected, to the end that upon exercising the least act of their religion, they might be juridically stripped of their property and lives. We do not find that the Banians are treated in this manner in the East Indies, although they are exactly upon the same footing there, as the Jews in Europe, separated from all nations by a religion as ancient as the annals of the world, united with them by the necessity of commerce, in which they act as factors, and as rich as the Jews in our part of the globe.

globe. These Banians, and the Guebres, who are as ancient and as much separated as them from the rest of mankind, are however every where well received; the Jews alone are held in detestation, by all nations whatsoever. Some Spanish writers pretend, that these people were grown formidable. They were dangerous indeed by the usury which they extorted of the Spaniards; but as they were not trained to war, there was no reason to be afraid of them. The Spaniards pretended also to be alarmed at the vanity, which these people derived from their having been settled in the southern coasts of this kingdom, long before the Christians. It is true they had been in Andalusia time immemorial. This truth they enveloped with ridiculous fables, such as have been at all times invented by this people, the sensible part of whom apply themselves wholly to trade, while rabbinism is left to those who can do no better. The Spanish rabbies had written a great deal, to prove that a colony of Jews flourished on this coast at the time of Solomon, and that the ancient Betica was tributary to this third king of Palestine. It is very probable that the Phœnicians, after discovering and founding colonies in Andalusia, established Jews there who might act as factors, as they have done in other countries; but in all ages the Jews have disfigured truth by the most absurd fables. They even had recourse to counterfeit medals and forged inscriptions. This kind of knavery, together with other more essential accusations, contributed not a little to precipitate their ruin.

Ever since that time the Spaniards and Portuguese have made a distinction betwixt the old and new Christians, between the families that intermarried with Mahometan or Jewish women.

Yet the government made but a short advantage of the oppression of this nation of usurers; for they soon felt the want of the revenue which the Jews used to pay to the king's treasury. The difference continued to be sensibly felt till they came to collect the riches of the new world. They redressed the evil as well as

they could by pontifical bulls. That of the crusade, which was granted by Julius II. in 1509, produced more to the government than the tax upon Jews. Every body is obliged to purchase this bull, in order that he may be entitled to eat flesh in Lent, and on Fridays and Saturdays throughout the year. They who go to confession cannot receive absolution without shewing this bull to the priest. They have since invented the *bull of composition*, in virtue of which you are permitted to keep stolen goods, provided you do not know the owner of them. Superstitions of this kind are as rank as those with which the Jews are charged. Folly and vice contribute to the public revenue of every country.

The form of absolution granted to those who purchase the bull of the crusade, is not unworthy of a place in this general view of the customs and manners of mankind: "By the authority of almighty God, of St. Peter and St. Paul, and of our holy father the pope, to me committed, I grant you remission of all your sins confessed, forgotten, and unknown; as also of the pains of purgatory."

Queen Isabella, or rather cardinal Ximenez, treated the Mahometans afterwards in the same manner as the Jews: a great number of them were forced to turn Christians, notwithstanding the capitulation of Granada; and such as returned to their own religion were burnt. As many Mussulmen as Jews fled into Africa, and yet no body could pity those Arabians who kept Spain so long in subjection, nor those Jews who so long plundered the kingdom.

The Portuguese were at this time emerging from obscurity; and notwithstanding the general ignorance which then prevailed, they began to deserve a glory as lasting as the world itself, by the change of universal commerce, which was soon the fruit of their discoveries. They were the first of the European nations that navigated the Atlantic ocean. The passage round the cape of Good Hope was first found out by their own countrymen; whereas Spain owed the discovery of America to foreigners. But it is to one man only, to the infant don Henry,

Henry, that the Portuguese are indebted for this undertaking, against which they murmured in the beginning. There has seldom been a great enterprise in any part of the world, but what has been due to some one person of genius and resolution, who has had courage to oppose the prejudices of the vulgar, or art enough to make them subservient to his purpose.

Portugal was so taken up with her great naval expeditions, and with her successes in Africa; that she did not concern herself in the affairs of Italy, which engrossed the attention of the rest of Europe.

C H A P. CIII.

Of the State of the Jews in Europe.

AFTER having observed how the Jews were treated in Spain, let us now see what was their situation in other parts of Europe. We ought to be particularly interested in the history of this people, since it is from them we derive our religion, together with many of our laws and customs; so that in truth we ourselves may be considered as Jews with a foreskin. You well know, that they every where exercised the business of brokers and itinerant traders; as they did in ancient times at Babylon, Rome and Alexandria. In France, their moveable possessions belonged to the lord, in whose lands they dwelt. "*The moveables of the Jews, say the regulations of St. Louis, belong to the baron.*"

A Jew could no more be taken from a baron, than his horse or his mule. The same law prevailed in Germany. The Jews are declared serfs by a regulation of Frederick II. A Jew was at first part of the emperors domains; afterwards every lord had his Jews.

Till the end of the fourteenth century, it was established by the feudal laws in most parts of Europe, that when a Jew embraced Christianity his effects were confiscated for the use of his lord. This, you will say, was no efficacious method to promote their conversion;

but at all events the baron was to be indemnified for the loss of his Jew.

In great towns, and especially in the imperial cities, they had their synagogues, and enjoyed some of the privileges of citizens, for which, however, they paid dearly; and when they became very rich, the magistrates did not fail to accuse them of having crucified a young child on Good Friday. It was on the strength of this popular accusation that in several towns of Languedoc and Provence, a law was established, allowing any one to beat or ill use a Jew, if he was found in the streets from Good Friday to Easter Day.

Their chief avocation having been from time immemorial the lending of money on pledges, they were forbidden to lend them on any church ornaments, or on bloody or wet linen or cloaths. The council of Lateran, in 1215, ordered that they should wear a little wheel on their breasts, to distinguish them from Christians. These badges were changed at different times; but they were always obliged to wear some one by which they might be known. They were expressly forbidden to take any maid servants or nurses who were Christians, or even concubines of that religion; and there were some countries in which they burnt those women who had lain with a Jew man, or those men who had lain with a Jew woman, for this unanswerable reason, which we find given by the great civilian Gallus, "That it is the same thing to lie with a Jew, as to lie with a dog."

Whenever they had any law-suit against a Christian, they were obliged to swear by Sabaoth, Eloï, and Adonai, and the ten names of God, and they were threatened with the *tertian*, *quartan*, and *quotidian* ague, if they did not speak the truth; to all which they replied, Amen. When any of them were condemned, they were sure to be hanged between two dogs.

In England they were permitted to take mortgages upon estates in the country, for monies lent thereon; and, in the *Monasticon Anglicanum*, we find, that it

cost six marks sterling to redeem any estate from a Jewish mortgage.

They were at different times driven out of almost all the towns in Christendom, but were almost always recalled. Rome alone has constantly kept them within her bosom. In the year 1394, they were totally driven out of France by Charles VI. and could never afterwards obtain permission to reside in Paris, where they had formerly occupied seven or eight whole streets. In Metz and Bourdeaux, they were permitted the use of synagogues, only because they were found in possession of that privilege at the time these towns were annexed to the crown of France; but they have constantly remained uninterrupted in Avignon, which is a part of the pope's territories. In a word, they were every where usurers, in virtue of the privilege and benediction of their own law, and every where held in detestation on that very account.

Their famous rabbies, Maimonides, Abrabanel, Aben Ezra, and others, in vain repeated to the Christians, in all their writings, "We are your fathers, our scripture is yours, our books are read in your churches, and our hymns are sung there;" they were answered only by being plundered, exiled, or hanged between two dogs. In Spain and Portugal it became a fashion to burn these unhappy people. Later times have been more favourable to them, especially in Holland and England, where they are suffered to enjoy their riches, and all the rights of society, of which no person ought to be deprived. They were even on the point of obtaining a general act of naturalization in England, in the year 1750, nay, the act had actually passed for that purpose; but, at length, the universal cry of the nation, and the ridicule that was cast upon the scheme, caused it to be repealed. Numberless were the burlesque prints and satyrical writings published on this occasion, in some of which my lord Aaron and my lord Judah were represented sitting in the house of lords; the people laughed, and the Jews comforted themselves with being rich and free.

It is no slight proof of the capriciousness of the human mind, to see the descendants of Jacob carried in procession to be burnt at Lisbon, and, at the same time, candidates for the most distinguished privileges of a British subject. In Turkey they are neither burnt nor raised to the dignity of bashaws; but they have made themselves the sole masters of the commerce of that country, and neither the French, the Venetians, the English, nor the Dutch, can either buy or sell there, but through the intervention of the Jews. These rich factors of Constantinople, despised as they are by the Turks, do not seem however to repent the loss of Jerusalem.

You seem to wonder at the hatred and contempt which the people of every age and nation have conceived for the Jewish nation: but you will observe that it was an inevitable consequence of their legislation; which was calculated to make them either conquerors or slaves.

They were commanded to hold every other nation in abhorrence, and to look upon themselves as defiled, if they only eat out of the same dish with any one of a different faith. They gave the name of *the Nations* to the inhabitants of twenty or thirty little towns in their neighbourhood, whom they were determined to destroy, and with whom they thought it a crime to have any thing in common. When their eyes were a little opened by other victorious nations, who taught them to their cost that the world was larger than they imagined; their very law made them enemies to these nations, and, in short, to all mankind. They obstinately persevered in their absurd policy, when it was their interest to have changed it; their superstitions increased with their misfortunes, and their conquerors were an uncircumcised people. A Jew thought himself as much forbidden to eat out of the same dish with a Roman, as with an Amorite. They retained all their customs, which are diametrically opposite to those of society in general; and accordingly they have been deservedly treated as a people who differ

differ in every thing from other nations; serving them through avarice, detesting them through fanaticism, and considering usury as a religious duty: and yet these people are our fathers!

C H A P. CIV.

Of the People called Bohemians, or Egyptians.

THERE was at that time another petty nation as unsettled, and as much despised as the Jews, and who addicted themselves to another species of rapine. They were a collection of strange people, to whom the French have given the name of *Bohemians*. In other countries they are called *Egyptians*, *Gypsies*, or *Syrians*, and in Italy *Zingani*, or *Zingari*. They wandered in troops from one end of Europe to the other, with tabors and castenets, dancing, singing, telling fortunes, shewing tricks of legerdemain, curing diseases with certain cant words, and stealing every thing that came in their way; they observed certain religious ceremonies among themselves, of which neither they nor any one else knew the meaning or the origin. These people have dwindled away considerably of late years, since mankind have begun to throw off the infatuated notions of witchcraft, talismans, predictions, and possessions by evil spirits. There are still some few of them to be met with, but they become very scarce. Nothing appears more probable than that these wretches were a remnant of the ancient priests and priestesses of Isis, intermixed with those of the goddess of Syria. These tribes, as much despised by the Romans as their ancestors had formerly been revered, carried their ceremonies and their mercenary superstitions with them all over the world. Wandering-missionaries of the faith they professed, they ran from province to province to make converts of those upon whom mere chance had confirmed their predictions, or who, having recovered by
the

the course of nature from some slight disorders, imagined they owed their cure to the miraculous efficacy of certain mysterious words and signs of these false prophets. The description which Apuleius gives us of these vagabond prophets and prophetesses, is the very picture of what those wandering tribes, called Bohemians or Gypsies, have for a long time been in every country in Europe. The castenets and tabors are the cymbals and crotals of the Isean and Syrian priests. Apuleius, who spent most of his life in searching after religious and magic secrets, speaks of the predictions, talismans, ceremonies, dances, and songs of these pilgrim priests, and, in particular, remarks their great skill in stealing whatever came in their way, either in the court-yards, or houses, where they were admitted.

When Christianity took place of the religion of Numa, and Theodosius had destroyed the famous temple of Serapis in Egypt, some of the Egyptian priests joined themselves to those of the goddess Cybele, and the goddess of Syria, and went about begging alms, in the same manner as hath been since practised by our mendicant friars; but as they could not expect any assistance from the Christians, they found it necessary to add the trade of quack doctors to that of pilgrim, and practised chiromancy or palmistry, and invented several singular dances. Mankind love to be amused and deceived, and therefore these offsprings of the ancient priests have continued even to the present time. Such has been the end of the ancient religion of Isis and Osiris, whose very names still impress respect. This religion, which in its origin was altogether emblematical and venerable, began so early as the days of Cyrus to degenerate into a medley of ridiculous and superstitious customs. It fell into still greater contempt under the Ptolemies: in the time of the Romans it was reduced to the most abject state, and at length we see it wholly left to a set of wandering thieves and pickpockets.

The same fate perhaps will sooner or later attend the Jews. When civil society becomes more improved,

improved, and every nation carries on its own trade, without any longer sharing the fruits of their labour with those wandering brokers, then the number of Jews must naturally diminish. The more wealthy amongst them begin already to despise the superstitions of their sect; and when these people, destitute of arts and laws, are no longer permitted to enrich themselves by our indolence, they will be unable to keep up a separate society; they will forget their old jargon, which is no other than a corrupt medley of Hebrew and Syriac, and thus losing the knowledge even of their own books, they will in time be confounded with the dregs of other nations.

C H A P. CV.

Continuation of the State of Europe in the Fifteenth Century.

—Of Italy.—Of the Assassination of Galeazzo Sforza in a Church.—Of the Assassination of the Medicis in a Church; and of the Share which Sixtus IV. had in this Conspiracy.

I SHALL here give a short view of the interests, customs, and manners of the different states, from the mountains of Dauphiny to the remotest part of Italy.

The state of Savoy, being less extensive than it is at present, including neither Montserrat nor Saluzzo, and being equally destitute of money and trade, was not considered as a barrier. Its princes were attached to the house of France, who lately had disposed of that government in their minority; and the passage of the Alps was open.

From Piedmont we descend into the dukedom of Milan, the most fertile part of Italy. This, as well as Savoy, was a principality of the empire, but a powerful principality, independent at that time of a weak empire. The dukedom of Milan, after having belonged

belonged to the family of the Visconti, had submitted to the laws of the bastard of a peasant, a great man, and son of a great man. This peasant was Francis Sforza, who by his merit rose to be constable of Naples, and to have a considerable power in Italy. His son, the bastard, had been one of those *Condottieri*, or chiefs of disciplined banditti, who used to let themselves out for hire to the Pope, the Venetians, and Neapolitans.

He had taken Milan towards the middle of the fifteenth century, and afterwards made himself master of Genoa, which had formerly been so flourishing a republic, and which, after having waged war nine different times against Venice, was now perpetually changing masters. The Genoese had surrendered themselves to the French in the reign of Charles VI. and soon after revolted. They submitted afterwards to the yoke of Charles VII. in 1448, and shook that off too. They offered themselves to Louis XI. who answered, that they might give themselves to the devil, but for his part he would have nothing to say to them. Then they were obliged, in 1464, to yield themselves up to this Francis Sforza, duke of Milan.

1476 Galeazzo Sforza, this bastard's son, was murdered in the cathedral of Milan on St. Stephen's day. I mention this circumstance, which in other respects would be frivolous, but here is of great importance. The murderers prayed to St. Stephen and to St. Ambrose with a loud voice, to give them courage to assassinate their sovereign. Poisoning, assassination, and superstition formed at that time the characteristic of the people of Italy. They knew how to take their revenge, but seldom how to fight. They had a great many murderers, and but few soldiers. Such had been the general destiny of this country since the time of the Othos. Wit, superstition, atheism, masquerades, verses, conspiracies, devotion, poisoning, assassinations, some few great men, and an infinite number of dexterous but unhappy wretches; such was the picture of Italy. The son of this unfortunate Galeazzo

Sforza,

yet an infant succeeded to the dukedom of Milan under the tutelage of his mother, and of the chancellor Simonetta. But his uncle, whom we call Louis Sforza, or Louis the Moor, drove away the mother, murdered the chancellor, and soon after poisoned his nephew.

It was this Louis the Moor, that negotiated with Charles the VIIIth, to make a descent into Italy.

Tuscany, a less fruitful country, was, to the duchy of Milan, what Attica had been to Bœotia. It was now a century since Florence had begun to signalize itself, as we have seen, by its commerce, and by the fine arts. The Medicis were at the head of this polite nation. Never was there a family in the universe that attained to power by so just a title, that of virtue and beneficence. Cosmo de Medicis, who was a private citizen at Florence, born in 1389, aimed at no great titles; but by commerce he acquired such wealth as might be compared to the greatest kings in his time. The use he made of his riches, was to relieve the poor, to create friends among the rich by lending them money, to embellish his country with fine structures, and to invite to Florence the learned Greeks who had been driven from Constantinople. During the space of thirty years the republic was governed solely by his counsels; while his only, and indeed most effectual intrigues, were acts of benevolence. After his decease it appeared by his accounts that he had lent vast sums to his countrymen, whom he never asked to pay him again. He died lamented even by his enemies, and 1464 Florence with one consent adorned his tomb with the title of Father of his Country, a title which not one of the kings who have gone before us in review could ever obtain.

His reputation gained his descendants the principal authority in Tuscany. His son governed the republic under the name of Gonfalonier; his two grandsons, Laurence and Julian, obtained the sovereign authority, but were assassinated in a church by conspirators, at the very elevation of the host. Julian died of his wounds, but Laurence recovered. The Florentines resembled 1487

the Athenians very much in government, as well as genius. Sometimes it was an aristocracy, at other times a democracy, but nothing did they fear so much as tyranny.

Cosmo de Medicis might be compared to Pisistratus, who, notwithstanding his power, was ranked among the sages of Greece. The sons of this Cosmo met with the same fate as the children of Pisistratus, who were assassinated by Harmonius and Aristogiton. Laurence escaped from the murderers in the same manner as one of the sons of Pisistratus; and, like him also, he revenged his brother's death. But there is one circumstance in this tragical affair at Florence, which we do not find in that of Athens; namely, that the religious chiefs entered into this bloody conspiracy. Pope Sixtus IV. laid the design, and the archbishop of Pisa fomented it.

From this transaction we may form a clear idea of the spirit and manners of those times. Sixtus IV. whose family name was La Rovere, was then sovereign pontiff. I shall not enter into an inquiry, as Machiavel has done, whether the Riarios, whom he caused to pass for his nephews, were his own children or not; nor with Michael Brutus, whether he begot them while he was only a Franciscan friar. It is sufficient to lead us to the knowledge of facts, that we are certain he sacrificed every thing to the interests of Jerome Riario, one of these pretended nephews. We have already observed, that the territories of the holy see were by no means so extensive as they are at present. Sixtus IV. wanted to strip the lords of Imola and Forli of their possessions to enrich Jerome. The two brothers Medicis supported these petty princes with money and forces. The pope thought he could not secure his authority in Italy, but by the ruin of the Medicis family. A banker of Florence, named Pazzi, who was settled at Rome, and was an enemy to the two brothers, offered his services to the pope to get them assassinated. Cardinal Raphael Riario, Jerome's brother, was sent to Florence to manage the plot, of which Salviati, archbishop of that city had already formed the plan; and Stefano, a priest who

was dependent on the archbishop, undertook to be one of the assassins. The conspirators pitched upon a day that a grand festival was to be held in the church of Santa Reparata, for the massacre of the Medicis and their friends, in the manner that the assassins of Galeazzo Sforza, had made choice of the cathedral of Milan, and the festival of St. Stephen to murder that prince at the foot of the altar. The instant of the elevation of the host was the time pitched upon to strike the blow, as then, the people being prostrate and attentive to their devotion, were not in a condition to obstruct the execution of the plot. Accordingly, at that very moment, Julian de Medicis was stabbed by a brother of Pazzi, and other of the conspirators. Laurence de Medicis was wounded by Stefano, but not so mortally but he had strength enough to take refuge in the sacristy.

When we see a pope, an archbishop, and a priest meditating such a crime, and chusing for the perpetration of it the very instant when their God shews himself to them in his temple, we cannot doubt of the atheism of those times. Certainly, if they had thought that their Creator really did appear to them under the form of consecrated bread, they would not have dared to offer such an insult to him: but history shews us, that although the common people adored this mystery, the grandees and statesmen laughed at it. They thought as the Romans did in the time of Cæsar, and from the force of their own passions concluded there was no religion. They all made use of this horrid argument; "Men have taught us nothing but falsehoods, therefore there cannot be a God." Thus the religion of nature was stifled in the hearts of almost all those who governed in those days; and never was any age more fruitful in assassinations, poisonings, treasons, and debauchery of every kind.

The Florentines, who loved the family of Medicis, revenged their cause, by putting to death all the citizens they could meet with, who had been concerned in the conspiracy. The archbishop of Florence was hung from

the window of the public palace. Laurence had the generosity, or prudence, to save the life of the cardinal nephew, whom the enraged people were going to put to death, at the foot of that very altar which he had himself stained with blood, and whither he now fled for safety.

One extraordinary circumstance attending this conspiracy was, that Bernard Bandini, one of the assassins, who had retired into Turkey, was afterwards delivered up to Laurence de Medicis, by the order of the sultan Bajazet, who thus became an instrument of punishing a crime of which pope Sixtus had been the author. But what was less extraordinary, the pope excommunicated the Florentines for having punished a bloody conspiracy, and even began a war against them for it, which was happily terminated by the prudence of Medicis. You may see by this, what sort of purposes religion and anathemas were made to serve in those days. It is not in the power of the most profligate imagination to invent any thing equal to these horrid transactions.

Laurence de Medicis, whose cause was thus revenged by his fellow citizens, preserved their affection the remainder of his life. He was surnamed the Father of the Muses, a title not equivalent to that of father of his country, but which announces that he was such in effect. It was a sight as admirable, as it was different from the manners of our times, to see this citizen engaged in commerce, with one hand selling the commodities of the Levant, and with the other supporting the burden of the republic; maintaining factors, receiving ambassadors, opposing the pope, making war and peace, giving counsel to princes, cultivating the belles lettres, exhibiting public spectacles to the people, and affording shelter to the learned Greeks of Constantinople. He equalled the great Cosmo in liberality, and surpassed him in magnificence. It was then that Florence was comparable to ancient Athens. There were, at one and the same time, the prince Pic of Mirandola, Politiano, Marcillo Ficino, Landino, Lascaris, Chalcondyles, and Marcillo, whom Laurence had gathered about

about him, and who were perhaps superior to the seven sages of Greece so much boasted of in history.

His son Peter, like him, had the chief (and almost sovereign authority in Tuscany, at the time of the expedition of the French, but with less credit than either his predecessors or descendants.

C H A P. CVI.

Of the Ecclesiastical State, and of Venice and Naples, in the fifteenth Century.

THE ecclesiastical state was not what it is at present; much less what it ought to have been, if the court of Rome could have availed itself of the donations which Charlemagne is supposed to have made, or of those which were really made by the countess Matilda. The house of Gonzaga was in possession of Mantua, for which it paid homage to the empire. Several lords, under the name of vicars of the empire, or of the church, enjoyed very fine estates, which are now in the hand of the pope. Perugia belonged to the house of Bailloni; the Bentivoglios had Bologna; the Polentini Ravenna; the Manfredi Faenza; the Sforzas¹⁴⁵¹ Pezaro; the Rimarios possessed Imola and Forli; the house of Este had long reigned in Ferrara, and the Pici at Mirandola. The Roman barons were likewise very powerful at Rome, so as to be called the pope's manacles. The Colonnas and the Ursini, the Conti, and the Savelli, first barons and ancient proprietors of the most considerable demesnes, ravaged the Roman state by their continual quarrels, like those great lords who waged war against each other in France and in Germany, during the weakness of those governments. The people of Rome, though assiduous at processions, and continually importuning their popes for plenary indulgences, used to rise up in arms at their death, to plunder their palaces, and to be ready to throw their bodies into

into the Tiber. This is what actually happened at the death of Innocent VIII.

After him was elected Roderigo Borgia, a Spaniard, who took the name of Alexander VI. a man whose memory has been rendered execrable by the cries of all Europe, and by the pens of all historians. The protestants who, in the following centuries, opposed the church of Rome, have swelled the accusation; we shall see presently whether they have imputed to him too great a number of crimes. The circumstances of his exaltation to the pontificate clearly shew us the manners and spirit of his age, which bears no sort of resemblance to ours. The cardinals, who elected him, knew that he had five children living, by his connexion with Vanoza. They must have foreseen, that the riches, the honours, and the authority of the ecclesiastical state would center in this family; yet they chose him for their master. The heads of the factions in the conclave sold their own interests, together with those of Italy, for trifling sums of money.

The Venetian dominions on the continent, extended from the banks of the lake of Como to the middle of Dalmatia. The Ottoman power had stripped this republic of almost all the territories, which she had formerly wrested from the Christian emperors in Greece; yet she still kept possession of the great isle of Candia, and had appropriated to herself the isle of Cyprus, in 1437, by the donation of the last queen, daughter of Marco Cornaro, a Venetian. But the city of Venice alone was, by her industry, equivalent to Candia and to Cyprus, and to all her territories on the continent. The wealth of other nations was conveyed to this capital, by the several channels of commerce: all the Italian princes were afraid of Venice, while she seemed to dread the irruption of the French.

Of all the governments of Europe, that of Venice only was regular, stable and uniform. It had but one radical defect, which was not indeed a defect in the eye of the senate: a counterpoise was wanting to the power of the Patricians, and encouragement to the Plebeians.

Plebeians. A private citizen never could raise himself by his merit in Venice, as in ancient Rome. The beauty of the English constitution, since the commons have had a share in the legislature, consists in this very counterpoise; the road being ever open to preferment for those who deserve it.

The Neapolitans, who were always a weak and restless people, equally incapable of governing themselves, of chusing a king, or of bearing with the prince upon the throne, were ready to submit to the first invader.

The old king Fernando was still upon the throne of Naples: he was a bastard of the house of Arragon; but illegitimacy at that time did not exclude from the crown. It was a bastard race that reigned in Castile; it was likewise the bastard race of don Pedro the Severe, that sat upon the throne of Portugal. Fernando, who had no other title to the crown of Naples, received the investiture from the pope, in prejudice to the heirs of the house of Anjou, who laid claim to that kingdom. But he was neither beloved by the pope his lord paramount, nor by his subjects. He died in 1494, leaving an unfortunate family behind him, whom Charles VIII. deprived of a crown which he could not keep, and whom, unfortunately for himself, he determined to persecute.

C H A P. CVII.

Of the Conquest of Naples, by Charles VIII. King of France, and Emperor.—Of Zizim, brother of Bajazet II.—Of Pope Alexander VI. &c.

CHARLES VIII. his council, and his young courtiers, were so intoxicated with the project of conquering the kingdom of Naples, that he surrendered Franche-Comté and Artois, part of his wife's spoils, to Maximilian, and restored Cerdagne and Roussillon to Ferdinand the Catholic, to whom he likewise paid a debt

debt of three hundred thousand crowns, on condition that he should not interrupt his expedition. He did not reflect that twelve villages contiguous to a state, are of more value than a kingdom four hundred leagues from home. He committed likewise another error, by confiding in the Catholic king.

The chimerical project of subduing not only a part of Italy, but of dethroning the sultan of the Turks, was the chief reason that induced Charles VIII. to conclude with Henry VII. king of England, a more disgraceful treaty than that which Louis XI. had formerly made with Edward IV. He engaged to pay the king of England six hundred and twenty thousand crowns of gold that he might not declare war against him. Thus did he make himself tributary to the warlike English whom he feared, that he might go to attack the effeminate Italians whom he did not fear. He seemed to think that disgrace and ignominy led to glory, and began by impoverishing himself, when his aim was to enrich himself by his conquests.

1494 At length Charles made a descent on Italy: his whole army consisted of sixteen hundred gend'armes, who, with their bowmen, composed a body of five thousand horse heavily armed, two hundred gentlemen of his life guard, five hundred light horse, six thousand French infantry, and six thousand Swiss: so ill was he provided with money, that he was obliged to borrow some on the road, and to pledge the jewels lent him by the duchess of Savoy. Yet his march spread terror and submission through the country. The Italians, who had been acquainted only with small culverines of copper drawn by oxen, were surprized to see the heavy artillery drawn by horses. The Italian cavalry was composed of a set of braves, who let themselves out at a very extravagant price to the *Condottieri*, and these obliged the several princes to pay still at a much dearer rate for their dangerous service. These captains took particular names to frighten the populace. One was called *Taille-cuisse* or *Cut-thigh*, another *Fier-a-bras* or *Arm-strong*, another *Fracasse* or *Havock*, &c. They were greatly

greatly afraid of losing their men; for which reason they strove to bear the enemy down with their weight, but seldom chose to come to blows. Those who lost the field were vanquished. There was more blood spilt within the town walls, in private quarrels and in conspiracies, than in engagements in the field. Machiavel relates, that in a battle fought in those days, only one trooper lost his life, who was suffocated in the croud.

The thoughts of a war, in which there must be downright fighting, frightened them all, so that none of them dared to make their appearance. Pope Alexander VI. the Venetians, and Louis the Moor, duke of Milan, who had invited the king into Italy, wanted to traverse his designs as soon as he arrived. Peter de Medicis, who had been obliged to sue for his protection, was, for this very reason expelled the republic: he retired to Venice, from whence he durst not stir, notwithstanding the king's protection, being more afraid of the private revenge of his countrymen, than confident of being supported by the French.

Charles entered Florence in triumph, and from thence proceeded to Sienna, which he freed from the yoke of the Tuscans, who soon after reduced it to its former subjection. From thence he marched on to Rome, where Alexander VI. was negotiating in vain against him. Here he made his public entrance like a conqueror. The pope took refuge in the castle of St. Angelo, but seeing the French artillery pointed against those weak walls, he sued for peace.

It cost the pope little more than a cardinal's hat to¹⁴⁹⁴ pacify the king. Brissonet, who, from a president of the accompts was become an archbishop, advised the king to this accommodation, which procured him the purple. A king is often well served by his subjects when cardinals, but very seldom by those who aspire to this dignity. The king's confessor took part in the intrigue. It was Charles's interest to depose Alexander; but he forgave him, and repented it afterwards. There never had been a pope more deserving of the indig-

nation of a Christian king. The Venetians and he had addressed themselves to the Turkish sultan Bajazet II. son and successor of Mahomet II. to help them to drive Charles VIII. out of Italy. We are told that the pope had sent a nuncio, named Bozzo, to the Porte, and from thence it was concluded that the union between the grand seignior and the pontiff was to be purchased by one of those atrocious murders, of which they begin now to conceive some horror, even in the seraglio at Constantinople.

The pope, by a chain of very extraordinary events, had *Zizim*, or *Gem*, brother of Bajazet, in his power. The manner in which this son of Mahomet II. fell into the hands of this pontiff, is as follows :

Zizim, who was beloved by the Turks, had disputed the empire with Bajazet, whom they detested : but notwithstanding the affection of the people he was defeated. In this distress he fled to the knights of Rhodes, now knights of Malta, to whom he had sent an ambassador. At first he was received as a prince to whom hospitality was due, and who might be of service to them ; but soon after he was treated as a prisoner. Bajazet paid the knights forty thousand sequins a year to hinder *Zizim* from returning to Turkey. The knights carried him to one of their commanderies in Poitou, called Bourgneuf. Charles VIII. received at the same time an ambassador from Bajazet and a nuncio from pope Innocent VIII. the predecessor of Alexander, in regard to this illustrious captive. The sultan demanded him, and the pope wanted to have him as a pledge for the security of Italy against the Turks. Charles sent *Zizim* to the pope, who received him with all the splendor that the sovereign of Rome could affect, before the brother of the sovereign of Constantinople. They wanted to oblige him to kiss the pope's feet ; but Bosso, who was an eye-witness to the transaction, assures us that the Turkish prince rejected this servile act with indignation. Paul Jovius says, that Alexander VI. contracted for the murder of *Zizim*, by a treaty with the sultan. Charles's
head

head was so full of his vast projects, that he thought himself sure of the conquest of Naples; and flattering himself with the hopes of becoming formidable also to Bajazet, he wanted to have this unfortunate brother again in his power. According to Paul Jovius, the pope gave him up after he had been poisoned: but it is uncertain whether the poison was administered to him by one of the pope's domestics, or by some person privately employed by the grand seignior. It was given out, however, that Bajazet had promised the pontiff three hundred thousand ducats for his brother's head.

Prince Demetrius Cantimir says, that according to the Turkish annals, Zizim's barber cut this prince's throat, and was rewarded for this villainous service by being made grand vizir. But it is not probable that they should raise a barber to be minister and general of the empire. Besides, if Zizim had been murdered in this manner, king Charles VIII. who sent back his body to his brother, would have known what kind of death he died of; and cotemporary writers would also have mentioned it. Prince Cantimir, and the accusers of Alexander VI. may be alike mistaken: the hatred the public bore to this pontiff was such, that they suspected him of every crime he was capable of committing.

The pope having sworn not to disturb the king any more in his conquest, was allowed to quit his confinement, and to appear again in the Vatican as sovereign pontiff. There, in a public consistory, the king paid homage of obedience, attended by John de Gannai, first president of the parliament of Paris, who ought not to have been present at such a ceremony. Charles kissed the feet of a person whom two days before he had arraigned as a criminal; and to complete the farce, he served Alexander's mass. Guicciardini, a cotemporary author of very great credit, assures us, that at church the king took his seat below the dean of the cardinals. We ought not therefore to be so greatly surprized, that cardinal de Bouillon, dean of the sacred college, adhering

to those ancient usages should, in our days, write to Louis XIV. *I am going to take the second place in the Christian world.*

Charlemagne had caused himself to be declared emperor of the west at Rome; and Charles VIII. was in the same place declared emperor of the east, but in a very different manner. One of the Paleologi, nephew to him who lost the empire and his life, made an useless renunciation of what was no longer to be recovered, in favour of Charles VIII. and of his successors.

After this ceremony Charles marched his army into the kingdom of Naples. Alphonso II. who had lately succeeded to that crown, hated by his subjects as much as his father, and terrified at the approach of the French, gave the world an example of a new kind of cowardice. He fled to Messina, and turned monk among the Olivetans. His son Fernando succeeded to the crown, but could not re-establish his affairs, which his father's abdication seemed to have rendered desperate. Finding himself quickly abandoned by the Neapolitans, he discharged them from their oath of allegiance; after which he retired to the little isle of Ischia, situated within a few miles of Naples.

1494 Charles being now master of the kingdom, and arbiter of Italy, entered Naples in triumph, without almost striking a blow. Here he prematurely took the titles of Augustus and of emperor. But at this time almost all the powers of Europe were secretly contriving to dispossess him of the crown of Naples. The pope, the Venetians, Louis the Moor, duke of Milan, the emperor Maximilian, Ferdinand of Arragon, and Isabella of Castile, entered into a league against him. Charles ought to have foreseen this confederacy, and to have been able to make head against it, before he undertook this expedition. He set out upon his return for France five months after leaving that kingdom; but such was either his infatuation, or his contempt for the Neapolitans, or rather his inability, that he left only four or five thousand French to preserve his conquest; and he had

had the weakness to suppose that the Neapolitan lords, whom he had loaded with his favours, would support his interests during his absence.

Upon his return near Placentia, not far from the village of Fornova, rendered famous by the battle fought in that neighbourhood, he found the confederate army about thirty thousand strong, while the French were only eight thousand. If he had been defeated, he must have lost either his liberty or his life: if he proved victorious, he could gain only the advantage of making a retreat. Then he shewed what great feats he might have done, if his prudence had been equal to his courage. The Italians soon gave way, and yielded him a very cheap victory; for he did not lose above two hundred men, whereas the confederates lost four thousand. Such is generally the advantage of a ¹⁴⁹⁵ small body of disciplined troops, commanded by their king, over a multitude of mercenaries. Guicciardini relates, that the Italians had not given so bloody a battle as this for many years. The Venetians reckoned it a victory to have plundered some of the king's baggage; and indeed his tent was carried in triumph through the city of Venice. By this victory Charles secured his retreat to France; but he left behind him the half of his little army in the neighbourhood of Novara, in the Milanese, where the duke of Orleans was soon surrounded.

The confederates had it still in their power to attack him with great advantage, but they would not venture. We cannot, said they, withstand *la furia Franceſe*. The French fared exactly in Italy as the English had done in France; they were victorious with small armies, and yet they did not preserve their conquests.

When the king arrived at Turin, he was surprised to see a chamberlain from pope Alexander VI. who commanded him to withdraw his troops from Milan and Naples, and to come and give an account of his conduct to the holy father, upon pain of excommunication. This bravado would have only excited laughter, if the pope's

pope's conduct in other respects had not been a very serious subject of complaint.

Charles returned to France, and shewed himself as careless about preserving his conquests, as he had been expeditious in making them. Frederick, uncle of Fernando the dethroned king of Naples, laid claim to the crown after Fernando's death, and, in a single month, recovered his whole kingdom, with the help of Gonsalvo de Cordova, known by the name of the *Great Captain*, whom Ferdinand of Arragon, surnamed the Catholic, sent to his assistance.

The duke of Orleans, who, not long after, succeeded to the crown of France, thought himself very lucky in being suffered to march out of Novara. In short, there soon remained not the least sign of this great torrent which had overwhelmed Italy; and Charles VIII. whose glory had been of so short duration, died without children, at the age of near eight and twenty, leaving it to Louis XII. to follow his first example, 1498 and repair his errors.

C H A P. CVIII.

Of Savonarola.

BEFORE we proceed to shew in what manner Louis XII. asserted his right to Italy, and what was the fate at length of this fine country, which had been rent by such a number of factions, and disputed by so many powers, and in what manner the popes formed the state which they are at present possessed of; we ought to bestow some attention on an extraordinary event, which at that time exercised the credulity of Europe, and displayed the power of fanaticism.

There was at Florence a Dominican friar, named Jerome Savonarola. This man was one of those preachers, whose talent of haranguing from the pulpit makes them believe that they are able to govern na-

tions ; one of those theologians, who, after explaining the Apocalypse, imagine they are endowed with the gift of prophecy. He directed, he preached, he heard confessions, he wrote ; and in a free city, necessarily divided into factions, he would fain be the head of a party.

As soon as the principal citizens of Florence knew that Charles VIII. was projecting an expedition into Italy, Savonarola foretold it, and the common people thought him inspired. He declaimed against pope Alexander VI. he encouraged likewise such of his countrymen as persecuted the Medicis, and had spilt the blood of the friends of this family. Never had man in Florence a greater influence over the vulgar. He was grown a kind of tribune of the people, by causing the artificers to be admitted into the magistracy. To be revenged of him, the pope and the Medicis had recourse to the same arms as those made use of by Savonarola, they sent a Franciscan friar to preach against him. The order of St. Francis hated that of St. Dominic more than the Guelfs hated the Gibelines.

The Franciscan succeeded in making the Dominican odious ; upon which the two orders became irreconcilable. At length a Dominican offered to walk through a burning pile, in order to prove the sanctity of Savonarola. A Franciscan proposed likewise the same ordeal, to prove Savonarola an impostor. The people naturally desirous of such a spectacle, insisted on its being exhibited ; and the magistrates were obliged to comply. Their minds were still possessed with the old fable of Aldobrandinus, surnamed *Petrus igneus*, who in the eleventh century had passed and repassed over burning coals ; and the partisans of Savonarola made no doubt but God would do for a Jacobin what he had done for a Benedictin. The contrary faction expected as much in favour of the Cordelier.

The piles were set on fire, and the champions entered the lists in the presence of a vast multitude of people. But when they saw the flames, they trembled ; and their common fear suggested to them a common
evasion.

evasion. The Dominican refused to enter the pile; unless he had the host in his hand: but the Cordelier pretended that this was a clause which had not been agreed upon. They both insisted obstinately on their point, and by thus helping each other to get out of the scrape, the public were deprived of the shocking spectacle.

The mob were so incensed by the adherents of the Cordeliers, that they wanted to lay hold of Savonarola; which the magistrates perceiving, ordered this friar to leave the city: but though he had the pope, the faction of the Medicis, and the people against him, he refused to obey. He was taken, and put seven times to the torture. The extract of his deposition mentions that he acknowledged himself to be a false prophet, a cheat, who abused the secrets of auricular confession, as well as those that were revealed to him by his brethren. Might not he well own himself an impostor? Must we not look upon him as an intriguing prophet, as a downright cheat? Perhaps he was more of the fanatic. The human imagination is capable of joining these two extremes which seem so opposite. If justice had been done him, imprisonment and penance would have been sufficient: but the spirit of party was concerned in the affair. He and two other Dominicans were sentenced to the flames which they had so boldly
 1498 defied: they were strangled however before they were thrown into the fire. The friends of Savonarola did not fail to attribute miracles to him, the last shift of the adherents of an unhappy chief. Let us not forget to mention, that when he was condemned, Alexander VI. sent him a plenary indulgence.

Methinks I see you look with an eye of commiseration, on these scenes of absurdity and wickedness, of which you will find no examples among the Greeks and Romans, nor even amongst barbarians. They were the effects of the most infamous superstition that ever debased the mind of man, and of the worst of all possible governments. But you well know, that it is not long since we ourselves emerged from this darkness, and that we are not yet compleatly enlightened.

C H A P.

C H A P. CIX.

Of Pic of Mirandola.

IF the adventure of Savonarola is sufficient to demonstrate the superstition of those days, the theses of the young prince of Mirandola, shew us what was the state of learning. It was at Florence and at Rome, among the most ingenious people in the world, that these two different scenes were acted. Thence it is easy to form an idea of the darkness which overspread other parts, and of the slow progress which the human mind makes towards improvement.

It is still a proof of the superiority of the Italians of that time in regard to literature, that John Francis Pic of Mirandola, a sovereign prince, was from his earliest years, a prodigy of study, and memory. Even in our days he would have been a prodigy of real erudition. So strong was his passion for the sciences, that at length he renounced his principality, and retired to Florence, where he died in 1494, the same day that Charles VIII. made his entry into that city. We are told, that at eighteen years of age he understood two and twenty languages. Surely this is not according to the ordinary course of nature. There is no language whatever but requires at least a year to understand it well. A youth that knows two and twenty, may be supposed to know them but very indifferently, or rather he knows only the elements, which is nothing at all.

It is still more extraordinary that this prince should have studied so many languages, and yet have been capable in his four and twentieth year to defend theses at Rome upon all sciences whatever. We find prefixed to his works fourteen hundred general conclusions, on which he offered to dispute. A little of the elements of geometry and the sphere, was in the course of that immense study all that may be said to have been worth

his trouble. The rest serves only to shew the spirit of the times. It is Aquinas's sum of divinity, with the quintessence of the works of Albert the Great, and in short, a mixture of theology and peripatetic philosophy. He tells us, that an angel is infinite *secundum quid*; that animals and plants spring *from corruption animated by a productive virtue*. The whole is in this taste. This is all they learnt in every university. Thousands of scholars filled their heads with these chimeras; and frequented, till their fortieth year, the schools where this gibberish was taught. Nor were they better instructed in other countries. Those who governed the world, were very excusable at that time for despising the sciences; and Pic of Mirandola may be said to have been very unhappy for having wasted his life and shortened his days in these serious reveries.

Few were the writers of real genius, since the times of Danté and Petrarch, who improving their time in the perusal of the best Roman authors, escaped this dark maze of erudition. Their works were chiefly adapted to the taste of princes, statesmen, ladies, and noblemen, who read only for amusement; and surely these were far more proper for the prince of Mirandola, than the complements of Albertus Magnus.

But the passion for universal science prevailed: and this consisted in learning a few words by heart on every subject without any sort of meaning. It is difficult to conceive how the same men, who reason so justly and with such exactness in regard to the affairs of the world and their interests, could be satisfied in regard to almost every thing else, with gibberish and nonsense. It is because we want to appear learned, rather than to learn; and when once the mind has been warped by erroneous principles in our younger days, we use no endeavours afterwards to set it right; on the contrary, we strive to confirm it in error. Hence it is that so many persons of good sense, and even genius, are led away by popular prejudices.

It is true that Pic of Mirandola wrote against judicial astrology: but we must not mistake; it was against the

the astrology in vogue at that time. He admitted another sort, the ancient, the true astrology, which, as he said, was neglected.

He tells us in his first proposition, "That magic, such as is practised at present, and as the church condemns, is not founded in truth, since it depends on the powers that are enemies to truth." By these very words, contradictory as they are, we see that he admitted magic, as a work of the devil, and this was the received opinion. Accordingly he asserts, that there is no one power in heaven or on earth but a magician can put in motion; and he proves that words are effectual in incantations, because God made use of words in arranging the universe.

These theses made a far greater noise, and met with a more flattering reception, than the discoveries of Newton, or the profound inquiries of Locke in our days. Of this whole body of doctrine pope Innocent VIII. caused thirteen propositions to be censured. This censure resembled in some measure the decisions of those Indians, who condemned the opinion that the earth is supported by a dragon, because said they, it can have no other support than an elephant. Pic of Mirandola wrote an apology, wherein he complains of his censors. He says, that one of them declaimed furiously against the *cabala*. "But do you know, said the young prince to him, the meaning of the word *cabala*?" "A pretty question, answered the theologian, is it not well known, that he was a heretic who wrote against Jesus Christ?"

After all, pope Alexander VI. who at least had the merit of despising these disputes, was obliged to send him an absolution. It is observable that he treated Savonarola and Pic of Mirandola both in the same manner.

The history of this prince is merely that of a scholar of prodigious genius, who ran through a vast career of errors, and followed guides as blind as himself. What follows is the history of those masters of deceit, who have established their power on the imbecility of mankind.

C H A P. CX.

Of Pope Alexander VI. and King Louis XII.

POPE Alexander VI. had two great objects in view, to recover the territories which were pretended to have been dismembered from the Roman see, and to procure a crown for his son Cæsar Borgia. The scandalous life of this pontiff does not seem to have lessened his authority; nor did the people of Rome ever rise up against him. The public accused him of an incestuous commerce with his own daughter Lucretia, whom he forced away from three husbands successively, the last of whom (Alphonso of Arragon) he caused to be assassinated, to marry her at length to the heir of the house of Este. These nuptials were celebrated in the Vatican with rejoicings the most infamous, and the most shocking, that human licentiousness ever invented. Fifty naked courtezans danced before this incestuous family, and prizes were given to those who displayed the most wanton gestures. It was the general report, that the duke of Gandia, and Cæsar Borgia at that time deacon, archbishop of Valentia in Spain and cardinal, who were the two sons of this pope, had quarrelled for the favours of their sister Lucretia. The duke of Gandia was assassinated at Rome, and Cæsar Borgia was suspected of having had a hand in the murder, and Guicciardini does not hesitate to lay it to his charge. As the personal estates of the cardinals devolved to the pope after their decease, there was a strong presumption that the pontiff had hastened the death of many a cardinal, whose effects he wanted to inherit. And yet the people of Rome were submissive, and all the powers of Europe courted Alexander.

Louis XII. king of France, and successor to Charles VIII. seemed more eager than any other prince to enter into a strict alliance with this pontiff, for which he had more reasons than one. He wanted to be divorced

from his wife, the daughter of Louis XI. with whom he had consummated his marriage, and who had lived with him two and twenty years without bearing any children. No human dispensation could authorize this divorce; and yet dislike and reasons of state rendered it necessary.

Anne of Britany, the widow of Charles VIII. preserved for Louis the same inclination as she had felt for him when duke of Orleans; and unless he had married her, he must have parted with Britany. It was an ancient but dangerous custom for princes to address themselves to Rome, either to obtain leave to marry their relations, or to be divorced from their wives. For as such marriages or divorces were frequently necessary to the state, the tranquillity of a nation must consequently have depended on the fancy or disposition of a pope, who might be an enemy to the kingdom.

The other reason which connected Louis XII. with Alexander VI. was his unhappy pretensions to several territories in Italy. Louis laid claim to the duchy of Milan, because his grandmother was sister of a Visconti, who formerly possessed this principality. In opposition to this claim the Italians might have pleaded prescription, and the investiture given by the emperor Maximilian to Louis the Moor, whose niece this emperor had married.

The common feudal law being ever obscure and uncertain, there was no way of interpreting it but by the sword. This duchy of Milan, this ancient kingdom of the Lombards, was a fief of the empire. There had been no determination as yet, whether it was a male or female fief, or whether the women could inherit. The grandmother of Louis XII. a daughter of Visconti duke of Milan, had by her marriage settlement only the county of Asti. This marriage settlement was the source of the troubles of Italy, of the disgrace of Louis XII. and of the troubles of Francis I. Most of the states in Italy were fluctuating in this uncertainty, being

being neither able to assert their freedom, nor to determine who was to be their master.

The pretensions of Louis XII. to Naples were the same as those of Charles VIII.

Cæsar Borgia, the pope's bastard, was commissioned to carry the bull of divorce into France, and to treat with the king about all these projects. Borgia, however, would not stir from Rome, till he had been assured of the duchy of Valentinois, of a company of a hundred gend'armes, and likewise of a pension of twenty thousand livres settled upon him by Louis XII. with a promise of prevailing on the king of Navarre's sister to marry this archbishop. Thus Cæsar Borgia, from a deacon and an archbishop, became a layman; and the pope, his father, granted a dispensation at the same time to his son and to the king of France; to the one to quit the church, to the other to quit his wife. The agreement was soon made; and Louis XII. prepared for a new expedition into Italy.

He had the Venetians on his side, who were to share part of the spoils of the dukedom of Milan: they had already taken the country of Brescia and Bergamo, and wanted at least the whole territory of Cremona, to which they had no more right than to the city of Constantinople.

The emperor Maximilian, who ought naturally to have defended his father-in-law and his vassal the duke of Milan, against France his natural enemy, was at that time incapable of defending any body. He was scarce able to maintain his ground against the Swiss, who had but just stript the house of Austria of what territories it had still left in that country. Maximilian therefore was obliged in this conjuncture to look on with a seeming indifference.

Louis XII. quietly put an end to some disputes between him and this emperor's son, Philip the Handsome, father of Charles V. and sovereign of the Low Countries; in consequence of which, Philip paid homage in person to France for the counties of Flanders and Artois. The chancellor Guy of Rochefort received this
homage

homage at Arras: being seated and covered, he held the prince's hands between his own, while the prince standing uncovered and without sword or girdle, pronounced these words, *I yield homage to the king for my peerages of Flanders and Artois, &c.*

The king likewise renewed the treaties of Charles VIII. with England, and having put his kingdom, at least for some time, in a state of defence on all sides, he marched his army over the Alps. It is remarkable that entering upon this war instead of increasing he diminished the taxes, and that by this indulgence he began to acquire the title of *father of his people*. But he sold several offices which are called royal, and especially those belonging to the finances. Would it not have been much better to have established an equal assessment of taxes, than to have introduced the shameful venality of public employments, into a country of which he wanted to be esteemed the father? The practice of exposing public employments to sale, came originally from Italy. The places in the apostolic chamber used to be disposed of for money at Rome, and it was not till within our memory that the popes abolished this custom.

The army which Louis XII. sent beyond the Alps, was not much stronger than that with which Charles VIII. had conquered Naples. But what must appear very extraordinary, is, that Louis the Moor, who was no more than duke of Milan, Parma, and Placentia, and lord of Genoa, had as considerable a body of troops as those of the king of France.

Here again we have another instance of what the *Furia Franceſe* could do against Italian cunning. The king's forces in ten days made themselves masters of the states of Milan and of Genoa, while the Venetians took possession of the territory of Cremona.

After Louis had taken these fine provinces by his generals, he made his public entry into Milan, where he received the deputies of all the states of Italy, as if he had been their common arbiter. But scarce was he returned to Lyons, when the French by their remissness,

ness, which is generally the consequence of their first impetuosity, lost the dukedom of Milan, in the same manner as they had lost Naples. In this short interval of success, Louis the Moor paid a ducat for the head of every Frenchman that was brought him. The king of France resolving to make another push, sent Louis de la Trimouille to repair the mistakes committed in Italy; and the French forced their way again into the Milanese. The Swiss, who ever since the reign of Charles VIII. made use of their liberty to let themselves out for hire, were in great numbers both in the French and the Milanese armies. It is remarkable that the dukes of Milan were the first princes that took Swiss troops into their pay. Maria Sforza set this example to sovereigns.

Some officers of this nation, which had hitherto resembled the ancient republic of Sparta in frugality, œconomy, equality of conditions, and the love of liberty and courage, sullied the glory of their country, by the love of money. The duke of Milan was at Novara, where he trusted the Swiss with his person preferably to the Italians. But far from meriting this confidence, they made their terms with the French. All that Louis the Moor could obtain, was to be suffered to accompany them in a Swiss dress, and with an halbert in his hand. Thus he passed in disguise in the midst of the French army; when those who sold him, soon made him known. He was taken, and carried to Pierre en cise*, and from thence to the same tower of Bourges where Louis XII. had been confined: he was removed afterwards to Loches, where he lived ten years longer, not in an iron cage, as is vulgarly believed, but treated with distinction, and permitted the last years of his life to take the air within five leagues of the castle.

Louis XII. being now master of the duchy of Milan and of Genoa, wanted only to be possessed of the kingdom of Naples; but he had reason to be afraid of

* A castle at Lyons, which is still used as a state prison. T. ed.

Ferdinand the Catholic, who had already driven the French out of that kingdom.

As he had therefore joined with the Venetians to conquer the duchy of Milan, the spoils of which they divided betwixt them, so now he united with Ferdinand to subdue the kingdom of Naples. The catholic king, who chose rather to strip, than to assist, a prince of his own house, entered into a treaty with Louis XII. by which he agreed to share this kingdom with him. The prince who sat at that time on the throne of Naples, and who was thus to be deprived of his dominions, was Frederick, the last king of the bastard branch of Arragon. Ferdinand kept Apulia and Calabria for himself; the rest was designed for France. Pope Alexander VI. the ally of Louis XII. entered into this confederacy against an innocent monarch his feudatory, and granted to the two kings the investiture which he had already given to the king of Naples. The catholic king dispatched his general Gonsalvo of Cordova to Naples, under the pretence of defending, but in reality to oppress his relation.

Some of the French troops marched by land, and the rest were transported by sea. It is certain that this expedition against Naples displayed only injustice, perfidy, and meanness; but Italy had been influenced by no other motives for more than six hundred years. As for the Neapolitans, they were not accustomed to fight for their kings.

The unfortunate monarch betrayed by his relation, pressed by the French forces, and bereft of all succour, chose rather to trust himself into the hands of Louis XII. whom he looked upon as a generous prince, than to venture his person with the catholic king, from whom he had received such perfidious treatment. He applied therefore to the French for a passport to quit his kingdom, and arriving soon after on the coast of France with five gallies, he received a pension from the king of one hundred and twenty thousand livres present currency. Strange destiny for a sovereign!

Louis XII. therefore had at the same time a duke of Milan prisoner, and a king of Naples attending his court in the quality of a pensioner. The republic of Genoa was become one of his provinces, and his subjects being but little taxed, France was one of the most flourishing kingdoms in the world; it wanted only the improvements of commerce and of the polite arts, which seem at that time to have been the peculiar glory of Italy.

C H A P. CXI.

Wickedness of the Family of Alexander VI. and of Cæsar Borgia.—Continuation of the Affairs of Louis XII. and Ferdinand the Catholic.—Death of the Pope.

POPE Alexander VI. was then executing in miniature, what Louis XII. was doing on a larger scale; he was subduing the fiefs of Romagna by the arms of his son. Every thing seemed to contribute to the grandeur of this son, but he did not enjoy it long: contrary to his intention, he was toiling only to enlarge the territories of the church.

There was no species of violence or artifice, no exertion of courage or villainy left unpractised by Cæsar Borgia. To subdue eight or ten small towns, and to get rid of a few lords, he used more art than the Alexanders, the Genghis-kans, the Tamerlanes, or the Mahomets ever had recourse to in conquering great part of the world. Indulgences were sold to raise an army; and cardinal Bembo assures us, that in the dominions of Venice alone, they disposed of to the value of near sixteen hundred marks of gold. They raised the tenth penny on all the revenues of the church, under the pretext of a war against the Turks; when they had only a little war at the gates of Rome.

Borgia began with seizing the towns belonging to the Colonnas and the Savellis in the neighbourhood of Rome:

Rome: then partly by force and partly by cunning, he made himself master of Forli, Faenza, Rimini, Imola, and Piombino; and in these conquests, treachery, assassination, and poisoning were part of his arms. He demanded, in the pope's name, artillery and troops of the duke of Urbino; the duke supplied him, and he employed them against the duke himself to strip him of his dukedom. He inveigled the lord of the town of Camerino into a conference, and then caused him and his two sons to be strangled. He prevailed, by means of the most solemn oaths, on four lords, the duke of Gravina, Oliverotto, Pagolo Vitelli, and another, to treat with him in the neighbourhood of Sinigaglia; the ambush was laid, and he cruelly massacred Vitelli and Oliverotto. Would one imagine that Vitelli, as he was expiring, should beg of the murderer to obtain of the pope, his father, an indulgence for him in the article of death? And yet this is mentioned by cotemporary writers. Nothing can be a stronger proof of human weakness, nor of the force of opinion. Had Cæsar Borgia died before Alexander VI. of the poison which they are said to have prepared for the cardinals, and to have drunk themselves, I should not be surprised if Borgia at his last gasp had asked a plenary indulgence of the pope his father.

At the same time Alexander VI. laid hold of the friends of those unfortunate noblemen, and ordered them to be strangled in the castle of St. Angelo. Guicciardini believes that the lord of Farneza, named Astor, a young man of remarkable beauty, being delivered up to the pope's bastard, was obliged to serve his beastly pleasures, and was afterwards sent, together with his natural brother, to the pope, who caused them both to be strangled. The king of France, who was stiled the father of his people, favoured those crimes in Italy, which he would have punished in his own kingdom. He resigned the blood of these victims to the pope, in order to obtain his assistance in the conquest of Naples. From a motive of policy, or state-

interest, he was guilty of injustice in favour of Alexander VI. But what kind of policy was it, what interest of state, to encourage the horrid cruelties of a man who soon after betrayed him!

It was the fortune of the French to conquer Naples, and their fate soon after to lose it. Ferdinand the catholic, or rather the *perfidious*, who had deceived his relation the last king of Naples, was not more faithful to Louis XII. for he quickly agreed with Alexander VI. to deprive the king of France of his share of the spoils.

Gonsalvo of Cordovo, who so well deserved the title of *Great Captain*, but not of a virtuous man, he who said that the cloth of honour ought to be coarsely spun, at first deceived and then defeated the French. I am of opinion that the French generals have been often more remarkable for that courage which honour inspires, than for abilities requisite in the conducting of great affairs. The French troops were commanded by a descendant of Clovis, the duke of Nemours, who challenged Gonsalvo to fight in single combat. Gonsalvo answered him by beating his army several times, and especially at Cerignola in Apulia, where Nemours
1503 was slain with four thousand French. It is said that only nine Spaniards were killed in this battle; an evident sign that Gonsalvo had chosen an advantageous post, that Nemours wanted military skill, and that his troops were disheartened. In vain did the famous chevalier Bayard withstand alone the attack of two hundred of the enemy on a narrow bridge; this was a glorious but useless effort.

In this war a new method was invented of destroying mankind. Peter of Navarre, a soldier of fortune, and a celebrated Spanish general, invented the springing of mines, the first effects of which were felt by the French.

And yet France was so powerful at that time, that Louis XII. was able to send three armies into the field, and a fleet to sea. Of these three armies one was designed for Naples, and the other two for Roussillon

fillon and Fontarabia. But none of those armies made any progress; and that of Naples was soon entirely dispersed, so bad was the conduct of the French, compared to that of the *Great Captain*. In short, Louis XII. irretrievably lost his share of the kingdom of Naples.

Soon after, Italy was delivered of Alexander VI. and his son. 1503 Historians unanimously mention, that this pope died of a poison which he had designed at a feast for several cardinals; an exit indeed becoming his life. But the fact is not probable. They pretend that upon a pressing occasion for money, he wanted the inheritance of those cardinals. But it is well attested that Cæsar Borgia carried away an hundred thousand ducats out of his father's treasury, after his decease; therefore he could not be in any real necessity. Besides, how could they have been so mistaken in that poisoned bottle of wine, which is said to have been the cause of the pope's death, and to have brought the son to the brink of the grave? Persons so long experienced in villainy, seldom leave room for such a mistake. They mention no body that ever avowed the fact; how came they then to the knowledge of it? If the cause of the pope's death had been known at the time he died, it would have been known to the very persons whom he wanted to poison. If so, they would not have left such a crime unpunished; they would not have suffered Borgia quietly to take possession of his father's treasure. The common people, who often hold their masters, and especially such masters, in abhorrence, having been kept in subjection under Alexander, would have broke through restraint at his death; they would have interrupted the interment of this monster, and torn his abominable son to pieces. In short, the journal of the house of Borgia takes notice that the pope, being seventy-two years old, was attacked with a tertian fever, which soon became continual, and proved mortal. Surely this is not the effect of poison. It is moreover said, that the duke of Borgia caused himself to be sown up in the belly

belly of a mule. I should be glad to know against what poison is a mule's belly an antidote? And how could this Borgia, just as he was dying, go to the vatican for the hundred thousand ducats? Was he shut up in the mule's belly when he carried off the treasure?

It is true that after the pope's decease there was a tumult at Rome; and that the Colonnas and the Urfinis returned to that capital with armed force: but this very tumult would have been a proper occasion for solemnly accusing the father and the son of so horrid a crime. In fine, pope Julius II. the mortal enemy of this family, and who had the duke a long time in his power, did not charge him with what he has been accused of by the public voice.

But on the other hand, why should cardinal Bembo, Guicciardini, Paul Jovius, Tomasi, and so many other cotemporary writers, agree in this strange accusation? Whence are so many circumstances derived? How come they to name the kind of poison employed, and which was called *Cantarella*? We may answer, that it is not difficult for accusers to invent, and that so horrid a charge should have been supported by probable arguments.

Alexander VI. left behind him a memory far more odious than that of the Neros and Caligulas, because a greater degree of guilt arose from the sanctity of his character. And yet it is to him that Rome is indebted for her temporal grandeur; it is he that enabled his successors to hold the balance of Italy. His son lost the whole fruit of his iniquity, which was gathered by the church. Almost all the towns which he had seized upon, surrendered themselves to others, as soon as his father died; and pope Julius II. afterwards obliged him to deliver up the rest: so that he was quickly stripped of all his fatal grandeur. The whole fell to the holy see, to whom this villainy proved more serviceable, than the abilities of a number of popes supported by the arms of religion. But it is remarkable that religion itself was not attacked at that time. We may
perhaps

perhaps be enabled to account for this, when we consider that most of the princes, ministers, and warriors of those days, being without any religion themselves, were therefore the less attentive to the crimes of the pope; their ambition led them to other objects, and they devoted no part of their time to reading. On the other hand, the common people were blinded by superstition. In short, the great lords who were employed in murdering and pillaging each other, saw in Alexander VI. only a man similar to themselves; and they still continued to give the name of holy see to the pontifical chair, though it was the seat of every species of wickedness.

Machiavel pretends that Borgia had so well concerted his measures, that he bid fair for attaining the sovereignty of Rome and of all the ecclesiastic state, after the death of his father; but little did he foresee that he himself should be at death's door at the time when Alexander was expiring. Friends, enemies, allies, relations, every body in short, either abandoned or betrayed him, as he had betrayed all the world. The great captain, Gonsalvo of Cordova, to whom he surrendered himself, sent him prisoner into Spain. Louis XII. deprived him of his duchy of Valentinois and his pension. At length he made his escape out of prison and took shelter in Navarre. Courage is not a virtue, but a happy quality, given in common to great men and villains: his did not fail him in this asylum. He was still true to his character; by his intrigues he obtained the command of the army of his brother-in-law the king of Navarre, whom he advised to crush the vassals of Navarre, as he himself had heretofore crushed the vassals of the empire and of the holy see. But he was killed sword in hand; and his death proved glorious: whereas in the course of this history we see lawful sovereigns and men of honour dying by the hands of the executioner.

C H A P. CXII.

The political Affairs of Louis XII. continued.

NAPLES might have been recovered by the French in the same manner as they recovered Milan; but through the ambition of the prime minister of Louis XII. this state was irrecoverably lost. Cardinal Chaumont d'Amboise, archbishop of Rouen, a prelate so much extolled for having had only one benefice, but to whom the administration of France was surely as good as a second, wanted to have another of a more exalted nature. He aimed at being pope after the death of Alexander VI. and they would have been forced to elect him, had his policy been equal to his ambition. He had money at command; and the troops designed against the kingdom of Naples were at the gates of Rome: but the Italian cardinals persuaded him to remove this army to some distance, that his election might appear more free, and consequently more valid. Accordingly he called off the troops; and
 1503 cardinal Julian de la Rovere made them elect pope Pius III. who died at the end of twenty-seven days: this cardinal Julian was afterwards chosen pope himself, under the name of Julius II. In the mean time, the rainy season hindered the French from passing the Garigliano time enough, and favoured the designs of Gonsalvo of Cordova. Thus the cardinal d'Amboise, though esteemed a man of abilities, lost the triple crown himself, and was the cause of his master's losing the kingdom of Naples.

A fault of another kind was likewise laid to his charge; and this was the incomprehensible treaty of Blois, by which the king's council, with the stroke of a pen, consented to dismember and destroy the French monarchy. In virtue of this treaty the king was to give his only daughter, by Anne of Britany, to the grandson of the emperor, and of king Ferdinand of Arragon,
 both

both his enemies; to that very prince, who, under the name of Charles V. proved so formidable to France and to Europe. Who would have imagined that her dowry was to consist of the duchies of Britany and Burgundy, and of Milan and Genoa, which were to be evacuated, and all right to those territories resigned? This is what Louis XII. was going to give away from France, in case he died without issue male. So extraordinary a treaty cannot be excused, but by saying that the king and the cardinal d'Amboise had no intention to keep it; and, in short, that the cardinal had learnt of Ferdinand the art of dissimulation.

The states general being assembled soon after at 1506 Tours, protested against this fatal partition. Perhaps the king, who had repented what he had done, had the artifice to make the whole kingdom apply to him, for a revocation of what he durst not revoke himself. Perhaps he was persuaded to yield to the remonstrances of the nation. Be that as it may, the heiress of Ann of Britany was hindered from marrying the heir of the house of Austria and of Spain, as Ann herself had been hindered from marrying the emperor Maximilian. She was married to the count of Angouleme, afterwards Francis I. by which means Britany, that had been twice united to France, and twice had been very near falling under another power, was incorporated with the kingdom; and Burgundy was prevented from being dismembered.

Another fault laid to his charge was the confederacy, into which he entered with all his secret enemies, against the Venetians his allies. This indeed was a most extraordinary and unexampled event, that so many kings should conspire the ruin of a republic, which three hundred years before was from a town of fishermen become the seat of opulence and commerce.

C H A P. CXIII.

Of the League of Cambray, and the Consequence of it.—Of Pope Julius II. &c.

POPE Julius II. a native of Savona in the territory of Genoa, with indignation beheld his country groaning under the yoke of France. An attempt made by the Genoese about that time to recover their ancient liberty, had been punished by Louis XII. with greater haughtiness than severity. He entered the city of Genoa with his drawn sword in his hand, and ordered all their charters and privileges to be burnt in his presence; then erecting a throne on a superb scaffold in the great market-place, he made the Genoese come to the foot of the scaffold, and hear their sentence upon their knees. But he condemned them only to a fine of one hundred thousand crowns, and built a citadel, which he called the *Bridle of Genoa*.

The pope, who like the rest of his predecessors, was desirous to drive all foreigners out of Italy, of course aimed at sending the French back beyond the Alps; but he wanted first of all the Venetians to join him, and to restore several towns which were claimed by the holy see. The greatest part of these towns had been wrested from their lawful sovereigns by Cæsar Borgia, duke of Valentinois: and the Venetians, ever watchful over their own interests, had immediately after the death of Alexander VI. made themselves masters of Rimini, Faenza, and of a great many estates in the districts of Bologna, and Ferrara, as also in the duchy of Urbino. They wanted to preserve these acquisitions; which Julius II. perceiving, made the French subservient to his designs against Venice, though a little before he had solicited the Venetians to arm against France. But he was not satisfied with having France on his side; he made all Europe join in the league.

There were very few sovereigns but had some claim or other on this republic. The emperor Maximilian had

had unlimited pretensions as emperor; and here I am able to mention a very interesting fact, which has escaped the Abbé Dubos, in his excellent History of the League of Cambray; a fact, which appears very extraordinary to us at this time, though it does not seem to have been considered as such by the German chancery; and this is, that the emperor Maximilian had already cited the doge Loredano, and the whole Venetian senate to appear before him, for having refused a passage through their territories to him and his troops, when he was going to be crowned emperor at Rome. The senate not having obeyed the summons, the imperial chamber condemned them for non-appearance, and put them under the ban of the empire.

It is therefore evident that, at Vienna, the Venetians were considered as rebellious vassals, and that the imperial court still continued to keep up its pretensions to the greatest part of Europe. If it had been as easy to take as to condemn Venice, this republic, which is the most ancient and flourishing of any in the world, would no longer exist; and liberty, which is the most sacred privilege of mankind, and of far greater antiquity than any empire on earth, would have been construed into rebellion. This was a strange kind of civil law!

Verona, Vicenza, Padua, the Marquisate of Trevisana and Friuli, were conveniently situated for the emperor. Ferdinand the Catholic, might retake several maritime towns in the kingdom of Naples, which he had pledged to the Venetians. This would have been an easy way of discharging his debts. The king of Hungary had pretensions to part of Dalmatia. The duke of Savoy might likewise put in his claim to the isle of Cyprus, because he was related to the house of Cyprus, which no longer existed. The Florentines, in quality of neighbours, had also some rights.

Almost all the powers who were at enmity with each other suspended their disputes, to join in the general league set on foot at Cambray, against the Venetians. The Turk, who was the natural enemy of this republic,

but then at peace with her, was the only power which did not accede to this treaty. In short, never did so many kings confederate against ancient Rome. Venice indeed was as rich as all these powers together; a circumstance in which she greatly confided, as well as in the dissensions which soon took place amongst so many allies. It was in her power to pacify Julius II. the principal author of the league; but she disdained to make any concessions, and had the courage to wait the impending storm. Perhaps this is the only time that ever she behaved with temerity.

The pope began his declaration of war with excommunications, which are more despised by the Venetians than by other nations. Louis XII. sent an herald at arms to denounce war to the doge. He demanded back the territory of Cremona, which he himself had resigned to the Venetians, when they helped him to take the dukedom of Milan: he laid claim also to Brescia, Bergamo, and to other places.

Fortune favoured the French on this occasion with the same rapid success, which had hitherto attended them in the beginning of all their expeditions. Louis XII. having put himself at the head of his forces, defeated the Venetian army at the famous battle of Agnadello, near the river Adda. Each of the pretenders seized on his share of the spoil; and Julius II. in particular took possession of all Romagna. Thus the popes, who are said to have been indebted to an emperor of France for their first possessions, owed the remainder to the arms of Louis XII. They were then masters of almost the whole extent of territory which they now possess.

The emperor's troops advanced, in the mean time, into the province of Friuli, where they took Trieste, which has ever since continued in possession of the house of Austria. The Spanish troops seized on what the Venetians held in Calabria. There was not one, even down to the duke of Ferrara, and to the marquis of Mantua, formerly a general in the Venetian service, but seized his prey. Venice now lost her intrepidity, became

became timid and irresolute : she abandoned the towns on the continent of her own accord, and released them from their oaths of allegiance ; at length being reduced to extremity, she implored the mercy of the emperor Maximilian, whose successes rendered him inflexible.

The senate, excommunicated by the pope and oppressed by so many princes, had now no other resource left than to throw themselves into the arms of the Turks. They deputed Louis Raymond, in quality of ambassador to Bajazet ; but the emperor Maximilian having been unsuccessful in the siege of Padua, the Venetians resumed their courage, and recalled their ambassador. Instead of becoming tributaries to the Ottoman Porte, they consented to ask pardon of pope Julian II. to whom they deputed six nobles. The pope ordered them to do penance, as if he had been carrying on the war in the name of God, and as if God had enjoined the Venetians not to defend themselves.

Julius II. having thus fulfilled his first design of aggrandizing Rome on the ruins of Venice, thought of executing the second ; which was to drive the *Barbarians* out of Italy.

Louis XII. returned to France, where, like Charles VIII. he grew as negligent in preserving, as he had been diligent in making, his conquests. The pope was reconciled to the Venetians, who being now recovered from their first panic, made a stand against the imperial forces.

At length the pontiff entered into a league with this very republic, and against those same French, whom he had employed to distress her. He wanted to destroy all the foreigners in Italy, by making them exterminate one another, to demolish the feeble remains of the German authority, and to form of Italy a puissant body, of which the pope should be the head. In this design he spared neither negotiations, money, nor labour. He headed the troops himself ; he mounted the trenches, and boldly exposed himself to danger. Our historians censure his ambition and his obstinacy ; but they should also have done justice to his courage and to the
greatness

greatness of his views. He was a bad priest, but as a sovereign, he merits our approbation as much as any prince of his time.

Louis XII. was guilty of a fresh mistake, which forwarded pope Julius's scheme. The former was remarkable for his œconomy, which might be stiled a virtue in the ordinary administration of a peaceful state, but a vice in great undertakings.

Through want of a good discipline the whole strength of the French armies at that time consisted in the gendarmery, who fought on foot as well as on horseback. They had not yet formed a good body of national infantry, though it was very practicable, as experience has since shewn; so that the kings of France were obliged to hire either German or Swiss foot.

The war in Italy was badly begun and badly ended by the French. The fate of Louis XII. was even more melancholy than that of Charles VIII. under whom the French had at least secured a glorious retreat by the battle of Fornova; whereas at the battle of Novara, under Louis XII. they were routed by the Swiss alone. This unfortunate battle completed their misfortunes and disgrace.—Louis de la Trimouille, who had been dispatched with an army to save at least some part of the duchy of Milan, was laying siege to Novara, when twelve thousand Swiss came to the relief of the place, before he had had time to secure himself by retrenchments. The Swiss, who had no cannon, immediately marched up to the French artillery, and having easily made themselves masters of it, destroyed the greater part of the infantry, routed the gend'armes, and thus gained a compleat victory, of which father Henault makes not the least mention. After this success they gave the duchy of Milan, which had been so long disputed by Louis, to Maximilian Sforza, whose father died a prisoner in France. Soon after this Louis XII. was deprived of Genoa. He had then no territories remaining beyond the Alps. Thus was so much blood and treasure lavished to no purpose; all his negotiations and wars terminated unfortunately.

It is well known that the Swiss, in particular, had contributed to the conquest of the duchy of Milan; for they had sold their blood, and even their honour, in delivering up Louis the Moor. The cantons now demanded an augmentation of their pension, and Louis refused it. The pope artfully laid hold of this conjuncture; he cajoled them, and gave them money; he encouraged them by the titles he so lavishly bestowed on them, of defenders of the church; in fine, he caused their preachers to declaim from the pulpit against the French nation. The people all flocked to these military sermons, which flattered their passion; in short, it was preaching a crusade.

By an odd change of conjunctures, the French were now the allies of the German empire, with which they had so often been at enmity; more than this, they were become its vassals. Louis XII. had given for the investiture of Milan one hundred thousand crowns to the emperor Maximilian, who was neither a powerful ally, nor a faithful friend, and who, as emperor, liked neither the French nor the pope.

Ferdinand the Catholic, who had always deceived Louis XII. deserted the league of Cambray as soon as he had got what he pretended to in Calabria. He received the full and intire investiture of the kingdom of Naples of pope Julius II. who by this step secured him in his interest. Thus the pope, by great policy, had brought over to his side the Venetians, the Swiss, the forces of the kingdom of Naples, and even those of England; while the French were obliged to withstand the joint efforts of all these powers.

Louis XII. thus attacked by the pope, summoned an assembly of bishops at Tours, to know whether it was lawful for him to defend himself, and whether the pope's excommunications were valid. Posterity will be astonished that such questions were ever started; but there was a necessity for respecting the prejudices of the times. I cannot help taking notice of the first case of conscience proposed in this assembly. The president asked whether the

the pope had a right to make war, when neither religion nor the temporal dominions of the church were concerned; and he was answered in the negative. It is evident to me that they did not state the question right; and that they answered the very contrary of what they should have answered. For in matters of religion and ecclesiastic possessions, if we adhere to the gospel, a bishop, so far from going to war, ought only to pray and to suffer; but in matters of politics, a sovereign of Rome can and surely ought to assist his allies, and to defend Italy. If Julius II. had confined himself to this, he would have been a great prince.

This French assembly made a worthier answer, by concluding to abide by the famous pragmatic sanction of Charles VII. to send no more money to Rome, and to tax the clergy of France in order to carry on the war against the pope, their Roman chief.

The operations were begun on the side of Bologna 1511 and Ferrara. Julius II. had already taken Bologna from the Bentivoglios, and he wanted to make himself master of Ferrara. By these invasions he destroyed the great design he had formed of driving all strangers out of Italy; for the people of Bologna and Ferrara seeing themselves attacked, naturally had recourse to the French for assistance against him, who after having been the avenger of Italy, was now become its oppressor. This ambition, which had outweighed all other considerations, plunged Italy into those calamities, from which it would have been glorious for him to have delivered her; and he suffered his interest so far to get the better of his prudence and even decency, as to admit into Bologna a numerous body of Turks, who had come thither with the Venetians to defend it against the French army, commanded by Chaumont d'Amboise. We are indebted for the knowledge of this singular fact to Paul Jovius, bishop of Nocera, who was an eye-witness thereof. Several former popes had taken up arms against the Turks, Julius was the first who made use of their assistance. He did what the Venetians were about to do,

do, and surely a greater insult could not be offered to Christianity. This pope, at the age of seventy years, laid siege to Mirandola in person, and was seen to mount the trenches with his helmet on, to visit the works, to press the engineers, and at length victoriously to enter the breach.

While the pope, worn out with old age, was fighting at the head of his troops, the king of France, still in the vigour of life, was assembling a council. He stirred up all the clergy of Christendom, and the pope all the soldiers. The council was appointed to meet at Pisa, where a few cardinals, enemies of the pope, made their appearance. But this council proved in the end an idle undertaking; whereas the war carried on by the pope was very successful.

It was to no purpose that medals were struck at Paris, on which Louis XII. was represented with this device, "*perdam Babylonis nomen*;" "I will destroy even the name of Babylon." It was a shame in him thus to menace, when he had so little power to execute.

The most striking proofs of courage, and, very often, even the most signal victories, serve only to raise the glory, but not to increase the power of a nation, when there is a radical defect in the government of it. This is what happened to the French in Italy. The brave chevalier Bayard was admired for his valour and generosity. Gaston de Foix, at the age of twenty-three, rendered his name immortal by repulsing the Swiss army, by rapidly crossing four rivers, by driving the pope from Bologna, and by gaining the famous battle of Ravenna, where he acquired so much glory,¹⁵¹² but lost his life. These were all signal exploits; but still the king was at too great a distance, his orders generally came too late, and were sometimes contradictory. His œconomy, at a time when he ought to have been liberal of his money, excited but little emulation. His troops were strangers to subordination; and the infantry being composed of foreigners, chiefly Germans, had very little attachment to the crown.

The gallantry of the French, and that air of superiority which was naturally assumed by conquerors, incensed the humbled and jealous Italians. But the fatal stroke was the emperor Maximilian's being prevailed on by the pope to issue out a proclamation, by which every German soldier in the French service was recalled, upon pain of being deemed a traitor to his country.

The Swiss immediately marched down from their mountains against those same French, who at the time of the league of Cambray had all the powers of Europe for their allies, but now had them all for their enemies. These mountaineers made it a point of honour to bring along with them the son of Louis the Moor, duke of Milan, and to expiate their treachery against the father by crowning the son.

The French, under the command of the marshal de Trivulce, abandoned all the towns they had taken, from the middle of Romagna to the confines of Savoy. The famous Bayard made very gallant retreats, like a hero who is obliged to yield to superior force. There was only the space of three months between the victory of Ravenna, and the total expulsion of the French. Louis XII. had the mortification to see the young Maximilian Sforza (son of the duke who died prisoner in France) restored to his inheritance by the Swiss. Genoa, where he had displayed the pomp of an Asiatic monarch, twice expelled the French, and recovered her liberty.

The Swiss, after having served France for hire, were now become her enemies, and to the number of twenty thousand laid siege to Dijon. Even Paris itself was struck with terror. Louis de la Trimouille, governor of Burgundy, could not send them home without paying them twenty thousand crowns in ready money, and promising them in the king's name four hundred thousand more, for which he was obliged to give them seven hostages. The king would let them have no more than one hundred thousand crowns; and even this sum was more than he would have been obliged to pay

pay their auxiliary forces, which he had so parsimoniously refused. The Swifs, incensed at receiving only a fourth part of their money, condemned the seven hostages to death. The king was then obliged to promise not only the whole sum, but likewise one half more. Luckily the hostages made their escape, and saved the king his money, but not his glory.

C H A P. CXIV.

The Affairs of Louis XII. continued.—Of Ferdinand the Catholic, and of Henry VIII. King of England.

THIS famous league of Cambray, which had been at first concerted against the republic of Venice, was now, by a strange vicissitude, directed against France, so as to prove fatal in the end to Louis XII. We find that there were chiefly two princes of greater abilities than himself; Ferdinand the Catholic, and the pope. Louis was formidable but a very short time; whereas ever after he had reason to fear most of the powers of Europe.

While he was losing Milan and Genoa, together with his treasure and his troops, they were depriving him also of a bulwark, which France had long had against Spain. His ally and relation, John d'Albret, king of Navarre, was suddenly stripped of his territories by Ferdinand the Catholic, who defended this violence by a pretence of religion; for he said, that he had a bull of pope Julius II. who excommunicated John d'Albret, as an adherent of the king of France, and of the council of Pisa. Navarre has been ever since incorporated with the Spanish monarchy.

The better to understand the policy of this Ferdinand the Catholic, famous for pretending to what he was ever violating, namely, sincerity and religion, we must see how artfully he made this conquest. He proposed to his son-in-law Henry VIII. king of England, to

join their forces in order to recover Guienne, the ancient patrimony of the English, who had been expelled
 1512 from thence above one hundred years. The young king of England, pleased with the project, sent a fleet to Biscay. Ferdinand made use of the English army to conquer Navarre, and left the English to re-imbark for their own country, without making any attempt upon Guienne, the invasion of which was impracticable. Thus he deceived his son-in-law, after having repeatedly tricked his relation the king of Naples, king Louis XII. the Venetians, and the pope. In Spain he was called *the wise, the prudent*; in Italy, *the pious*; in France and in England, *the perfidious*.

Louis XII. had put Guienne into a good posture of defence; but he was not so fortunate in Picardy. Henry VIII. embraced this opportunity to make an irruption on this side into France, which was open to the English, who were still in possession of Calais.

The young king, fired with ambition and courage, attacked France by himself, without waiting for succours from the emperor Maximilian, or from Ferdinand the Catholic, his allies. The old emperor, always enterprising, and always poor, served in the king of England's army, and was not ashamed to receive the stipend of an hundred crowns a day. Henry VIII. with his English troops alone, threatened to revive the fatal times of Poitiers and Agincourt. He gained a complete victory at the battle of Guinegaste, which is
 1513 called *the battle of the spurs*. He took Terouane, which is now destroyed; and he also made himself master of Tournay, a city time immemorial incorporated with France, and the cradle of the French monarchy.

Louis XII. had buried his wife Anne of Britany, and now he concluded a peace with Henry VIII. by marrying his sister Mary of England: but whereas kings as well as private persons receive a dower with their wives, Louis paid one. It cost him an hundred thousand crowns to marry his conqueror's sister. Thus, after having been obliged to submit to the extortions of the
 English

English and of the Swiss, after having been deceived by Ferdinand the Catholic, and driven from his Italian conquests by the steadiness of pope Julius II. he soon finished his career.

1515

As Louis XII. imposed but very few taxes, he was surnamed the *Father* of his people. But the heroes with whom France at that time abounded, would likewise have given him the title of their father, if by raising necessary taxes he had preserved his territories in Italy, given a check to the Swiss, afforded effectual assistance to Navarre, and repulsed the English.

But though he was unfortunate abroad, he was far from being so at home. All that he can be reproached with, is the sale of employments, which in his reign did not extend to judicial offices. In a reign of seventeen years he raised by this means the sum of twelve hundred thousand livres in the district of Paris only; but the land-tax and the duties on merchandize were very moderate. During the whole course of his reign, he was careful not to lay any heavy burden on his subjects. He did not think he was king of France, in the same manner as a private person is lord of his estate, merely to draw his subsistence from it. There was no new impost in his time: and when Fromentau presented to that squanderer Henry III. in 1580, a comparative account of what was exacted under this unhappy prince, and what was paid under Louis XII. at each article there appeared an immense sum for Henry III. and a very moderate one for Louis, if it was an old duty; but if it was an extraordinary tax, at the article of Louis XII. there was a cypher only: and unhappily this account of what was not paid under Louis XII. and what was exacted by Henry III. contains a large volume.

This king's revenue was only about thirteen millions of livres; but these thirteen millions were equivalent to near fifty of our present money. Provisions were at that time much cheaper, and the state was not in debt. It is not therefore to be wondered that this slender revenue, with prudent management, enabled him to live

in

in splendor, and to make plenty flourish throughout his kingdom. He took care that justice should be administered in every province expeditiously, impartially, and with as little expence as possible. The judges fees were forty times less than what they are at present. In the district of Paris there were only forty-nine bailiffs, and now there are above five hundred. It is true that this capital was not then the fifth part of what it is in our days. But the number of officers of justice has increased in a much greater proportion than the city of Paris; and the evils, inseparable from great towns, have been augmented more than the number of inhabitants.

He countenanced the custom which had been adopted by the parliaments of the kingdom, of chusing three of their members to fill a vacant place. The king named one of the three. The higher offices of the law were at that time conferred only on advocates; and usually on such as had the greatest merit, or at least a certain degree of reputation which supposes merit. His ever memorable edict of 1499, which our historians ought not to have passed over in silence, has endeared his memory both to those who distribute and to those who love justice. In this edict he directs, "That the law shall be always strictly adhered to, notwithstanding any orders repugnant thereto, which may at any time thenceforward be procured from the sovereign."

The general plan we have adopted in this historical essay will allow but few of these details; but particulars like this, which constitute the good of a state and may be a lesson to good princes, become a principal object.

Louis XII. was the first king of France that secured the husbandman against the rapaciousness of the soldiers; and that inflicted capital punishments on the gend'armes who extorted any thing from the peasants. Five gend'armes were put to death; and the country people were ever afterwards unmolested. Though he was neither a great hero, nor a great politician, he acquired far more solid glory, that of being a good king, and his memory will be ever dear to posterity.

C H A P.

C H A P. CXV.

Of England, and its Misfortunes after invading France. Of Margaret of Anjou, Wife of Henry VI. &c.

POPE Julius II. in the midst of the dissensions with which Italy was continually rent, being still resolute in his design of clearing his country of foreigners, increased the temporal power of the papal see far beyond any thing his predecessors had ever enjoyed. He dismembered Parma and Placentia from the dukedom of Milan, and joined them to the ecclesiastical state with the consent of the emperor himself. Julius concluded his pontificate and his life, with this action which does honour to his memory. This territory is no longer in the pope's possession. At that time the holy see, as a temporal state, held the balance of power in Italy. 1513

Venice, tho' at war with Ferdinand the Catholic king of Naples, was still a respectable republic, being able to withstand at the same time the attacks both of the Mahometans and of the Christians. Germany was at peace: England began again to be formidable; but we must inquire into the causes that weakened this kingdom, and the means by which it recovered its strength.

The distempered brain of Charles VI. had been the ruin of France; and the weak head of Henry VI. was not less fatal to England.

The relations of this prince began with quarrelling about the administration in his youth; just as the relations of Charles VI. threw every thing into confusion that they might command in this prince's name. At Paris, the duke of Burgundy had caused the duke of Orleans to be assassinated; and at London, the duchess of Gloucester, the king's aunt, was accused of having attempted to take away her nephew's life by witchcraft. A poor woman, who was reckoned a witch, and a foolish or knavish priest, who was counted a necromancer, 1442

mancer, were burnt alive for this pretended conspiracy. The duchess was sentenced to do public penance, and to be imprisoned for life. The spirit of philosophy was yet at such a distance from this island, that it was the center of superstition and cruelty.

It is observable, that the quarrels of princes usually end in marriage. Charles VII. made a match between
 1444 Henry VI. and Margaret of Anjou, daughter of René of Anjou, king of Naples, duke of Lorraine, and count of Maine, who with all these titles had no dominions, not so much as a small dower to give his daughter. Very few princesses were ever more unfortunate in a father and in a husband. She was a woman of an enterprising spirit, and of unshaken courage; to a degree that she might justly be stiled an heroine, if she had not begun by sullyng her virtues with a heinous crime. She had every political ability, and every military virtue: but she sometimes gave into those cruelties, which ambition, war and factions inspire. Her temerity and the pusillanimity of her husband, were the original source of the public calamities.

Her design was to govern the kingdom, which she could not do without getting rid of the duke of Gloucester, the king's uncle, husband of that very duchess
 1447 who had been already sacrificed to her enemies, and was now confined in prison. The duke was arrested under pretence of a new conspiracy, and the next day was found dead in his bed. This proceeding rendered the queen's administration, and the king's name, odious. The English seldom hate their princes without conspiring against them. There was at that time in England a descendant of Edward III. whose branch was one degree nearer to the original stock than that which sat upon the throne. This was the duke of York. He wore in his arms a white rose, and Henry VI. of the branch of Lancaster, wore a red rose. This is the source of those famous names consecrated to civil war.

In England, factions have usually arisen under the sanction of the parliament; but when the contest has ceased, that assembly has usually submitted to the conqueror.

The

The duke of York impeached the duke of Suffolk, prime minister and favourite of the queen, who by these two titles had done enough to incur the hatred of the nation. We have here a strange example of the effect of popular aversion. The court, to content the people, banished the prime minister out of England, who in consequence of this sentence embarked for France. The captain of a man of war, stationed on the coast, falling in with the ship in which this minister sailed, asked who was on board. The master answered, that he was carrying the duke of Suffolk to France. You shall not carry a man abroad, said the captain, that has been a traitor to his country; and immediately he ordered his head to be struck off. Thus the English behaved in full peace; but the civil war soon opened a more dreadful scene.

Henry VI. was subject to a kind of weakness, which for years together rendered him unfit for all business. This same century beheld three sovereigns in Europe, whom a disorder of the brain involved in the heaviest calamities, namely, the emperor Wenceslaus, Charles VI. king of France, and Henry VI. of England. One of those unfortunate years when the king was relapsed into his illness, the duke of York and his party gained a superiority in the council. The king, like a person recovered from a long lethargy, opened his eyes, and perceived he had lost his authority. Margaret of Anjou, his wife, advised him to shew himself a king; but this he could not do without drawing the sword. The duke of York having been expelled the council, soon put himself at the head of an army. Henry was dragged to the battle of St. Albans, where he was wounded and taken prisoner, but not yet dethroned. His conqueror, the duke of York, conducted him in triumph to London; and suffering him to bear the title of king, he assumed to himself that of *protector*, a title already known to the English.

Henry VI. often infirm in body, and always in mind, was little better than a prisoner treated with the pageantry of a king. The queen wanted to break his

fetters in order to be at liberty herself: and indeed her courage was superior to her misfortunes. She raised an army according to the custom of those days, by the assistance of the lords of her party: and having prevailed on her husband to leave London, she headed his forces. Thus the English, in a very short time, saw four French women who had the command of troops, the wife of the count of Montfort in Britany, the wife of king Edward II. in England, the maid of Orleans in France, and Margaret of Anjou.

1460 The queen drew up the army herself in order of battle, and fought close to her husband at the bloody battle of Northampton. The duke of York, her inveterate enemy, was not in the opposite army; but his eldest son, the earl of March, was there learning the rudiments of war under a person of the greatest renown in those days. This was Richard Nevil, Earl of Warwick, a man fitted by nature for those troublesome times, possessing singular abilities in the cabinet, and at the same time the most intrepid courage in the field; a man, in short, fruitful in expedients, capable of attempting every thing, and formed as it were to dispose of crowns. The earl of Warwick's good genius prevailed over Margaret of Anjou. Her army was defeated; and she had the mortification to see the king her husband made prisoner in his tent: but while the unhappy prince was stretching out his arms to his wife, she was obliged to fly away with her son the prince of Wales. The victorious party re-conducted Henry the second time to his capital, where he was treated as a prisoner, though he still preserved the title of king.

A parliament being now summoned; the duke of York, heretofore protector, aspired to a higher dignity. He claimed the crown, as the representative of Edward III. to the exclusion of Henry VI. born of a younger branch. This great question between the king and the pretender to the crown, was solemnly argued in the house of lords. Each side gave in his reasons in writing, as at common trials. The duke of York, notwithstanding his success in the field, could not obtain a complet

a compleat victory in parliament. Here it was decided that king Henry should continue to reign for life, and that the duke of York should succeed him to the exclusion of the prince of Wales. To this bill a clause was added, which became a fresh source of war and disturbance, that if the king broke through this law, the crown from that moment should be forfeited to the duke of York.

The queen, notwithstanding her ill success, her precipitate flight, her distance from her husband, and her having to contend with the victorious duke of York, with the city of London, and with the parliament, still did not lose her courage. She went into the principality of Wales, and the neighbouring counties, where by soliciting her old friends and creating new ones, she at length raised another army. It is obvious that these were not regular troops, long trained to discipline, and paid by one commander. Each lord brought as many men into the field as he could tumultuously collect; and these men were supported by pillage. The consequence was, that they were obliged either to come quickly to an engagement, or to disperse. The queen at length, having drawn together a body of eighteen thousand men, met her enemy the duke of York, near the castle of Sandal in the county of York. Fortune that day favoured her courage. The enemy's army was defeated; the duke of York fell in the engagement; and his second son, Rutland, was killed in the pursuit. The father's head, with those of some of the general officers, was fixed upon the wall, where they long remained a monument of their defeat. 1460

Margaret, after gaining this victory, marched up to London, in order to set the king her husband at liberty. The earl of Warwick, the soul of the York party, had still an army, in which he dragged about the captive king. The two armies met in the neighbourhood of St. Albans, a place famous for more battles than one, and the queen had also the good fortune of obtaining the victory. Here she had the singular pleasure of seeing the redoubtable earl of Warwick flying before her, 1460

and of restoring her husband on the field of battle to his liberty and authority. Never had woman greater success nor greater glory; but the triumph was very short. The city of London still held out, for Warwick had taken care to secure it in his interest. The queen therefore could neither gain admittance, nor pretend to force the city with so weak an army. The earl of March, the duke of York's eldest son, soon entered the town, breathing fury and revenge. The queen after her victories was obliged to retire to the north of England, where she endeavoured to strengthen her party, which the presence of the king now rendered more considerable.

1460 In the mean time, Warwick, finding himself master in London, assembled the people in a field not far from the city gates, and presenting the duke of York's son to them, "Which, says he, will you have for your king, this young prince, or Henry of Lancaster?" The people answered, "York." The voice of the multitude supplied the place of a parliament, for there was none sitting at that time. Warwick assembled a few lords and bishops, who voted that Henry VI. of Lancaster had broke through the act of parliament, because his wife had taken up arms in defence of her husband. The young duke of York was therefore proclaimed king in London by the name of Edward IV. while his father's head was still upon the walls of York, for having been guilty of high treason. Thus was Henry VI. deprived of his crown, after he had been proclaimed king of France and England in his cradle, and after he had reigned eight and thirty years, free from every reproach but that of imbecility.

As soon as the queen received this news, she assembled an army of sixty thousand men in the north of England. This was a prodigious effort; but she exposed this time neither her husband's person nor her own, nor that of her son. Warwick led his young king at the head of forty thousand men, against the queen's army; and came up with them at Towton, near the banks of the river Aire, on the borders of Yorkshire.

Yorkshire. Here was fought the bloodiest battle that¹⁴⁶¹ ever depopulated England; for cotemporary writers make the number of the slain to amount to six and thirty thousand. This great slaughter will appear the less extraordinary, when we recollect that these battles were fought by an undisciplined multitude, who quitted the plough for a few weeks to carry on a civil war. The two armies were generally closely engaged; they fought with all the inveteracy of party rage, and hence those horrid massacres of which there are but few instances now a days, when battles are fought by hired and regularly disciplined troops. The earl of Warwick having gained a complete victory, Edward IV. found himself secured on the throne. Margaret of Anjou in this distressed situation fled into Scotland with her husband and her son. After the battle, king Edward ordered his father's head to be taken down from the walls of York, and the heads of the principal officers among the enemy to be put in its stead. In the course of these horrid wars, each party in their turn put their prisoners to death by the hands of the common executioner. England was thus a bloody theatre, where they were continually erecting scaffolds on the very field of battle. France had been equally unhappy under Philip of Valois, John, and Charles VI. but the misfortunes of that country were occasioned by the English, whereas the troubles of these people, from the time of Henry VI. to that of Henry VII. were due only to themselves.

C H A P. CXVI.

Of Edward IV.—Of Margaret of Anjou, and the Death of Henry VI.

THE misfortunes of Margaret of Anjou did not extinguish her courage. Finding but very little encouragement in Scotland, she crossed over into France through

through the midst of the enemy's fleet. She applied for succours to Louis XI. who was then in the beginning of his reign: and though through bad policy he refused her any aid, Margaret was not disheartened. She borrowed money and ships; and after having obtained a supply of five hundred men she set sail from France. The queen, in her passage, was separated by a storm from her little fleet. At length however, she landed in England, and after assembling some forces, resolved once more to try the fortune of war, and to expose her own person, together with her husband and
 1463 son. Another battle was fought near Hexham, where she was likewise defeated. After this overthrow she found herself deprived of every resource. Her husband fled on one side; herself and her son on the other; without domestics or attendants, and exposed to every hardship and difficulty. In the pursuit Henry fell into the enemy's hands, who brought him back with ignominy to London, where they confined him in the Tower. Margaret had the good fortune to escape with her son into France, to her father René of Anjou, who could only pity her misfortunes.

The young king Edward IV. having been thus delivered of all his enemies, and made master of Henry's person, by the assistance of the earl of Warwick, was in peaceable possession of the throne. But as soon as he was at his ease, he grew ungrateful. The earl of Warwick, who had been a father to this prince, was negotiating a match between him and Bona of Savoy, sister to Louis XIth's queen. When the marriage was just upon the point of being concluded, Edward happening to see Elizabeth Woodville, widow of sir John
 1465 Grey, fell in love with her, married her in private, and at length declared her his queen, without acquainting Warwick. After giving him this offence he slighted him, removed him from his council, and made him his irreconcilable enemy. Warwick's policy was equal to his courage, and he soon exerted both in revenging himself of Edward. He seduced the duke of Clarence, the king's brother; he set England again in flames; and

and it was no longer the *red rose* against the *white*, but a civil war betwixt the king and his provoked subject. Battles, truces, negotiations, treasons, succeeded each other with the greatest rapidity. At length Warwick having driven Edward out of England, went to the Tower to release that very king Henry VI. whom he had deposed; and restored him again to the throne. This earl was called the *king maker*. The parliament in 1470 those days did little more than echo the will of the strongest: Warwick caused one to be called, which immediately restored Henry to all his rights, and declared that same Edward IV. on whom they had a few years before conferred the crown, a traitor and usurper. We are not yet come to the catastrophe of this long and bloody tragedy. Edward IV. had taken shelter in Holland, but had still a powerful party in England, whither he returned after seven months banishment. His partisans opened the gates of London to him; and Henry, the sport of fortune, just after his restoration was sent again to the Tower. His wife, Margaret of Anjou, ever ready to succour him, and fruitful in expedients, was at that time upon her return to England with her son the prince of Wales, and at her landing received the news of this disaster. The earl of Warwick, who had been so long her persecutor, was now become her defender, and marched against Edward. Thus there were still some hopes left for this unfortunate queen: but scarce had she heard of her husband's second imprisonment, when a courier came to acquaint her while she was yet upon the coast, that Edward had gained a complete victory over the earl of Warwick, who was killed in the engagement.

It seems wonderful, that after such a multitude of 1471 disasters a woman should still have ventured to try her fortune. But her undaunted courage always procured her friends. Whosoever had a party in England, was sure, at the expiration of some time, of finding his partisans strengthened by the aversion of the people for the court and ministry. This in some measure was as good as an army to Margaret of Anjou, after such

a number of revolutions and defeats. There was scarce a county in England where she had not fought; but the banks of the Severn and Tewksbury park were the last field of battle. She commanded the troops in person, and led the prince of Wales through the ranks; the battle was obstinate, but at length victory declared in
 1471 favour of Edward IV. The queen missing her son in the confusion of the flight, and being able to get no tidings of him, fainted away. In this condition she was found in a chariot; and upon coming to herself, she saw her son a prisoner, and her conqueror Edward before her. The mother and the son were parted: the queen was conducted to London, and sent to the very Tower where the king her husband was already confined. While the mother was disposed of in this manner, Edward, addressing himself to the prince of Wales, "How dared you, said he, to venture into my dominions?" "I am come into my father's territories," replied the prince, to revenge his cause, and to rescue my inheritance out of your hands." Edward was so provoked at this reply, that he struck him on the face with his gauntlet; and we are told by historians, that king Edward's two brothers, the duke of Clarence, then restored to favour, and the duke of Gloucester, together with some lords, fell like so many wild beasts on the prince of Wales, and inhumanly butchered him. When the first persons of the realm could commit such barbarities, what notion must we form of the common people? They pardoned no prisoner whatever; and now they resolved to put Henry VI. to death.

The respect which in those barbarous times they had entertained above forty years for the personal virtues of this monarch, had hitherto restrained the hands of those assassins; but after they had thus murdered the prince of Wales, they began to have less regard for the king. It has been asserted that this very duke of Gloucester, afterwards Richard III. who had imbrued his hands in the blood of the son, went himself to the Tower to murder the father. This horrid assertion may be true; though it is far from being probable, unless as the ingenious

genious Mr. Walpole observes, the duke of Gloucester had received from his brother Edward IV. a patent appointing him to the office of executioner. They spared ¹⁴⁷¹ Margaret of Anjou, because they expected the French would ransom her. And so it fell out four years afterwards, when Edward, having established peace at home, went over to Calais to declare war against France: Louis XI. concluded a shameful treaty, by which he prevailed upon him for a sum of money to return to England, and by the same agreement he gave him fifty thousand crowns for the heroine's ransom. This was a great sum to the English, who were impoverished by the wars of France, and by their own domestic dissensions. Margaret, after having defended the rights of her husband and son, in twelve pitched battles, died in 1482; the most unfortunate, and, were it not for the murder of her husband's uncle, the most venerable queen, wife, and mother in Europe.

C H A P. CXVII.

Continuation of the Troubles of England under Edward IV, under the Tyrant Richard III, and to the End of the Reign of Henry VII.

EDWARD IV. being now peaceably seated on the throne, the triumph of the white rose was complete, and its power cemented by the blood of almost all the princes of the red rose. Upon considering the conduct of Edward IV. there is no body but would imagine him to have been a barbarous prince, whose thoughts were intirely taken up with glutting his revenge: yet he was a man of pleasure, as much intangled in the intrigues of women as in those of state. He did not want the regal dignity to render himself agreeable. Nature had formed him the handsomest as well as the most amorous man of his time; but, by a surprizing contrast, had infused into so tender a breast such a dispo-

sition to cruelty as fills us with horror. He ordered his brother Clarence to be tried for his life on the most frivolous pretences; and the only favour he shewed him was the permitting him to chuse the manner of his death. Clarence desired to be drowned in a butt of
 1478 wine; a strange and unaccountable fancy! But whether he was drowned in this manner, or put to death in any other more probable way, still the result is the same, and equally proves the barbarity of Edward, and the weakness of the people in suffering themselves to be governed by such a relentless tyrant.

The secret of pleasing his subjects, was to make war against France. We have already seen, under the article of Louis XI. how Edward IV. crossed the sea in 1475, and by how shameful a policy Louis XI. gave a sum of money to this king, at that time less powerful and less settled on the throne than himself, to persuade him to return to England. To purchase peace of an enemy, is enabling him to wage war. Edward therefore proposed to his parliament, in 1483, to invade France again. Never was there a proposition accepted of with more general satisfaction; but just as he was
 1483 preparing for this expedition, he died, at the age of forty-two.

As he was naturally of a very robust constitution, his brother Richard, duke of Gloucester, was suspected of having hastened his death by poison. This was not judging rashly of the duke of Gloucester, another monster born to perpetrate even the most horrid crimes in cool blood.

Edward IV. left two sons behind him, the eldest of whom, named Edward V. was at that time thirteen years of age. Gloucester formed the design of taking these children out of the hands of the queen, their mother, and of causing them to be murdered, in order to make way for himself to the throne. He began with making himself master of the king's person, who was at that time in the neighbourhood of Wales; but it was necessary likewise to get the duke of York into his power. He employed every kind of artifice
 I for

for this purpose, and the weak mother at length consented to place her second son in the hands of the traitor, thinking it would be more difficult for him to commit two murders than one. Richard ordered the two princes to be sent to the Tower, pretending it was for their greater safety. But when this double assassination was to be put in execution, he met with an obstacle in his way: his emissaries having founded lord Hastings, a man of a sour disposition, found him too much attached to the young king ever to be accessory to his death. Gloucester finding his secret in such dangerous hands, did not hesitate a moment about what he had to do: the council of state was assembled in the Tower, at which lord Hastings was present. Richard entered with his officers, and going up to lord Hastings, *I arrest thee*, says he, *for high treason. Who! me, my lord?* answered the accused. *Yes, thee, traitor*, said Gloucester; and at that very instant he ordered his head to be cut off in the presence of the 1483 council.

Having thus got rid of a person who knew his secret, and despising those forms of law, by which the most flagitious crimes were justified in England, he hired a set of wretches, the very dregs of the people, to assemble in Guildhall, and tumultuously declare that they would have Richard duke of Gloucester for their king. The next day, the lord mayor of London, followed by this rabble, went and offered him the crown; Richard accepted it, and was crowned without calling a parliament, or without the least pretext for this irregular proceeding. He only caused it to be rumoured that king Edward IV. his brother, was born in adultery, shewing that he was not ashamed to dishonour his mother. This report was circulated only to satisfy the lower orders of the people. Those of a higher rank were influenced by fear, or the intrigues of the tyrant, and were in every respect as contemptible as the vulgar.

Scarce was he crowned, when one Tyrrel strangled, it is said, the young king and his brother in the

1483 Tower. The nation were apprized of this horrid murder, and only murmured in secret, so greatly were they changed with the times. The duke of Gloucester, under the title of Richard III. enjoyed two years and an half the fruit of the greatest villainy that England had ever yet beheld, notwithstanding it had been so much accustomed to scenes of horror and iniquity.

Mr. Horace Walpole has ventured to call in question the truth of this horrid imputation. But it is certain that in the reign of Charles II. the bones of the two princes were found, exactly in the same place in which they were said to have been interred. Perhaps of the multitude of crimes imputed to this tyrant, there are some which he did not commit. But if posterity has formed any rash opinions of this prince, they are excusable for so doing. It is well known that he confined his two nephews, and that they never afterwards made their appearance; it is Richard himself, therefore, who must answer for this.

1484 During his short enjoyment of the crown, he summoned a parliament, in which he ventured to have his right examined. There are times in which the people behave cowardly, in proportion to the tyranny of their masters. This parliament declared that the mother of Richard III. had been guilty of adultery; that neither the late king Edward, nor his other brothers were lawful issue; that the only legitimate son was Richard, and consequently, that the crown was his right, exclusive of the two young princes murdered in the Tower, but concerning whose death they made not the least mention. The parliaments of England may have committed greater cruelties, but never were guilty of so infamous an act. Many ages of virtue must pass away before the stain of so base a condescension can be wiped away.

At length, at the end of two years and an half, an avenger made his appearance. After the murder of so many princes, there was still left a sprig of the red rose, concealed in Britany, whose name was Henry
earl

earl of Richmond. He was not a descendant of Henry VI; but like him, he derived his original from John of Gaunt, duke of Lancaster, son of the great Edward III: yet as this descent was by the female line, and by a very ambiguous marriage of this very John of Gaunt, Richmond's right to the crown would have been extremely precarious, if it had not been strengthened by the horror which the nation had conceived against the crimes of Richard III. Henry was as yet very young, when he formed the design of revenging the blood of so many princes of the house of Lancaster, of punishing Richard III. and of conquering England. His first attempt was unsuccessful, and after his party had been defeated, he was obliged to return for shelter to Britany. Richard entered into a private negotiation with the minister of Francis II. duke of Britany, father of princess Anne, who married Charles VIII. and afterwards Louis XII. The duke himself was not capable of so base an action, but his minister Landois was; and, in fact, he promised to deliver up the earl of Richmond to the tyrant. The young prince fled in disguise from Britany to the territory of Anjou, where he arrived but just an hour before the officers that were in pursuit of him.

It was the interest of Charles VIII. at that time king of France, to protect the earl of Richmond: the grandson of Charles VII. would have been greatly deficient in politics, if having it in his power to prejudice the English, he had omitted doing it. And yet Charles lent him no more than two thousand men. This was indeed enough, supposing Richmond's party considerable: but it soon increased; and Richard himself when he heard that his rival had landed with so small a force, ¹⁴⁸⁵ judged that he would soon find an army. The whole principality of Wales, where this young prince was born, armed in his favour. At length Richard and Richmond came to an engagement at Bosworth, in the neighbourhood of Leicester. Richard wore the crown on his head, intending to remind the soldiers that they were fighting for their king against a rebel. But lord Stanley,

Stanley, one of his generals, who had long with horror beheld this bloody usurpation, betrayed his unworthy master, and went over with the body of troops under his command to the earl of Richmond. Richard had courage, which was his only good quality. When he saw the battle grown desperate, he furiously rushed into the midst of his enemies, and there received a more glorious death than he deserved. His body being found among the slain, was carried all naked and bloody to the town of Leicester on horseback, his head hanging on one side, and his feet on the other. There he was two days exposed to the view of the populace, who reflecting on the horrid crimes he had committed, had no sort of pity for him. Lord Stanley, who had taken the crown off his head, after he had been killed, carried it to Henry of Richmond.

The conquerors sang *Te Deum* on the field of battle, and after this prayer the whole army with one common voice cried out, "Long live king Henry." This day put an end to the distractions with which the white and red roses had ravaged England. The throne, after such a number of bloody revolutions, was at length settled on a solid basis. The misfortunes which had so long persecuted the family of Edward III. were now at an end; for Henry VII. by marrying a daughter of Edward IV. re-united the rights of the houses of York and Lancaster in his own person. He knew how to govern, as well as to conquer. His reign, which lasted four and twenty years with very little disturbance, softened, in some measure, the manners of the nation. The parliaments, which he called and directed, made very prudent laws; the administration of justice was perfectly restored; and commerce, which began to flourish under the great Edward III. and had been ruined during the civil wars, was seen once more to raise its head. England indeed wanted it: we have an instance of its poverty in the extreme difficulty which Henry VII. had to raise, by way of loan, two thousand pounds sterling, upon the city of London. His inclination joined to his necessities rendered him covetous.

If

If he had been only an œconomist, he would have been considered as a wise prince; but his sordid parsimony and fiscal acquisitions, were the means of staining his glory. He kept a private register of what the confiscations were worth to him; a meanness to which no great prince ever descended. At his decease they found in his coffers two millions sterling: this was an immense sum; but it would have done much greater service by circulation, than by lying dead in the treasury. However, in a nation more inclined to bring about revolutions than to grant money to their sovereign, there was a necessity for the king's having a private treasure.

His reign was a little disturbed by two surprising adventures. A journeyman baker*, who pretended to be nephew to Edward IV. disputed the crown with him. Having been taught by a priest to play his part, he¹⁴⁸⁷ was crowned at Dublin, and going over to England ventured to give battle to the king in the neighbourhood of Nottingham. He was taken prisoner; but Henry thought he should sufficiently humble the faction by placing their king in his kitchen, where he served a long time as a scullion.

Enterprizes of an arduous nature, though unsuccessful, oftentimes excite a spirit of imitation: people are encouraged by a striking example, and hope for better success. This is instanced by the six false Demetrius's, successively seen in Muscovy, and by many other impostors. The journeyman baker was followed by the son of a Jew broker at Antwerp, who acted his part much better.

This young Jew, whose name was Perkin, pretended to be son of Edward IV. The king of France, desirous of fomenting the seeds of division in England, entertained him at his court, and greatly encouraged him in the beginning; but afterwards thinking it better policy to keep fair with Henry VII. he abandoned this impostor to his fate.

* Lambert Symnel.

1493 The old duchess dowager of Burgundy, sister of Edward IV. and widow of Charles the Bold, who set this spring a going, acknowledged the young Jew as her nephew. He carried the farce on much longer than the young journeyman baker. His shape, his air, his valour, seemed to render him worthy of the rank he usurped. He married a princess of the house of York, who loved him even after the cheat was discovered. He kept the king's forces at bay five years; he even
 1498 put Scotland into motion, and more than once retrieved his losses. At length he was abandoned and delivered up to the king, who only condemned him to imprisonment; but upon attempting to make his escape, his head paid for his temerity. Then it was that the spirit of faction subsided, and that the English, no longer troublesome to their king, began to be formidable to their neighbours; especially when Henry VIII. ascending the throne, was by the extreme œconomy of his father, become possessor of an ample treasure, and by a prudent government had established his authority over a nation, who, though of a warlike disposition, were yet as submissive to him as it is possible for Englishmen to be.

C H A P. CXVIII.

General Idea of the sixteenth Century.

THE beginning of the sixteenth century, upon which we have already entered, will be found to exhibit the noblest objects to our view, that the theatre of the world ever afforded. If we consider the sovereigns who at that time reigned in Europe, we shall find their glory, or their conduct, or the great revolutions of which they were the cause, to be such as have rendered their names immortal. At Constantinople we see a Selim, who conquered Syria and Egypt, which the Mahometan Mamalukes had possessed since the thirteenth

teenth century. After him follows his son, the great Solymán, who the first of the Turkish emperors, marched up to Vienna; who was crowned king of Persia at Bagdat, which submitted to his arms; and who made Europe and Asia tremble.

In the North at the same time we behold Gustavus Vasa shaking off a foreign yoke in Sweden, and chosen king of that nation, whose freedom he asserted.

In Muscovy we observe, the two brothers Basilowitzs or Basilides, rescuing their country from the Tartars, to whom it was tributary: it is true, these princes were barbarians, and chiefs of a nation of barbarians: yet the deliverers of their country deserve a rank among great princes.

In Spain, in Germany, and in Italy, we see Charles the Vth, the sovereign of all those countries under different titles; we see him bearing the burden of Europe; ever fighting or negotiating; successful a long time in politics and in war; the only powerful emperor since Charlemagne; and the first king of all Spain since the conquest of the Moors; stemming the torrent of the Ottoman arms; making kings, and a multitude of princes; and at length laying down the crowns with which his head was loaded, to end his days in retirement, after having so long disturbed all Europe.

We find his rival in glory and politics, Francis I. king of France, less fortunate, but more amiable and courageous, dividing between Charles Vth and himself the affection and esteem of nations. In the midst of his defeats, we see him crowned with glory, and rendering his kingdom flourishing notwithstanding his misfortunes, by transplanting the polite arts into France, which in Italy were arrived at their highest degree of perfection.

Henry VIII. king of England, a prince too cruel and too capricious to be ranked among heroes, has yet his place among these kings, both because of the revolution which he made in the minds of the people, and of the balance which England began in his reign to hold among the powers of Europe. He took for his device

a warrior stretching a bow, with these words: "He whom I assist, is victorious;" a device which has been sometimes verified by his nation.

Pope Leo X. is celebrated for his wit, for his amiable behaviour, for the eminent artists who immortalized his age, and for the famous revolution which divided the church in his time.

At the beginning of this same century, religion and the pretence of reforming the established law, those two great instruments of ambition, produced the same effects on the coast of Africa as in Germany; the same among Mahometans as among Christians. A new government and a new race of kings were established in the vast empire of Morocco and Fez, which extends as far as the deserts of Nigritia. Thus Asia, Africa and Europe, experienced at the same time a revolution in religion. The Persians separated themselves for ever from the Turks, and though acknowledging the same God and the same prophet, they completed the schism of Omar and Aly. Soon after, the Christians were divided also among themselves, and the Roman pontiff found himself divested of his jurisdiction over one half of Europe.

Thus the ancient world received a violent shock, while the new world was discovered and conquered for Charles V. At the same time a trade was opened between the East-Indies and Europe by the ships and arms of the Portuguese.

On one side, Cortez subdued the powerful empire of Mexico, while Pizarro made the conquest of Peru, with a smaller number of troops than is now required in Europe to lay siege to a little town. On the other side, Albuquerque in the East Indies, established the dominion and trade of Portugal with almost as small a number of forces as the Spaniards, notwithstanding the opposition of the Indian kings, and in spite of the efforts of the Mahometans who were in possession of that trade.

Nature seems at that time to have produced extraordinary men in almost every kind, especially in Italy.

But

But what is still more surprizing in this illustrious age, is, that notwithstanding the wars excited by ambition, and notwithstanding the religious quarrels which began to embroil the states of Europe, that same genius which made the polite arts flourish at Rome, Naples, Florence, Venice and Ferrara, and from thence communicated its discoveries to the rest of Europe, civilized at the same time the manners of mankind in almost every part of Christendom. This change was in part owing to the court of Francis I. This prince and Charles the Vth had entered into a contest of glory, chivalry and politeness, even in the midst of their most bloody quarrels; and this contest having created an emulation in the courtiers, adorned that age with an air of grandeur and politeness till then unknown in Europe.

The opulence of the age contributed likewise to this change; and this opulence growing more general, was, by a strange revolution, in some measure, the consequence of the fatal loss of Constantinople: for not long after, the whole commerce of the Ottoman empire was carried on by Christians, who sold even the spices of the Indies to the Turks, loading their ships with this commodity at Alexandria, and afterwards transporting it to the ports of the Levant. The Venetians, in particular, carried on this trade not only till the conquest of Egypt by the sultan Selim, but even till the time at which the Portuguese began to engross the whole trade of the Indies to themselves.

Industry was every where excited. Marseilles carried on a considerable trade, and Lyons had excellent manufactures. The towns of the Low Countries were grown more flourishing than when subject to the house of Burgundy. The introducing of the fair sex to the court of Francis I. made it the center of magnificence as well as of politeness. The manners of the people were more gloomy in England, where a cruel and capricious prince sat on the throne; but London at that time was beginning to taste the sweets of commerce.

In

In Germany, the cities of Augsburg and Nuremberg were now the mart of the riches of Asia, which they drew from Venice; so that they soon felt the effects of their correspondence with the Italians. In Augsburg they had several houses, the walls of which were adorned with paintings *in fresco* after the Venetian taste. In a word, Europe was beginning to see halcyon days, when they were suddenly troubled by the storms which the emulation between Charles V. and Francis I. unfortunately raised; but above all, the religious disputes which broke out at that time, fullied the end of this century to such a degree, as to render it horrible, and to infect it with a kind of barbarousness, unknown even to the ancient Huns and Vandals.

END OF VOL. II.



